

and now seems to be the basis of their opposition to return that authority to the FTC. It is now amply clear, quite to the contrary of such self-interest assertions, that the USDA personnel at the time of the transfer from FTC in 1921 were not "well equipped to undertake supervision of the complicated relationships characteristic of the livestock and meat industry." In fact, such personnel hardly even exist, let alone are they well equipped today for title II enforcement.

#### SOUND ADMINISTRATION DEMANDS TRANSFER

On the other hand, it is certain that if the Congress is ever going to be able to get effective administration of the laws it passes, it must recognize the need to group similar functions together for administrative purposes. Sound principles of organization dictate the reasonableness of this position. We have only ourselves to blame when we establish an independent agency, such as the FTC, to carry out a specific function like the prevention of unfair trade practices, and then proceed to dismember that agency by transferring its functions to other agencies and departments not equipped nor staffed to do the job.

Now I have heard the argument that packers are a vital part of agriculture, and, as such, the USDA should be responsible for preventing unfair trade practices in that industry. If this be so, and all logic is against it, then, by parity of reasoning, every other processor of agricultural products is also a vital part of agriculture and such antitrust authority over them also should be exercised by the USDA. It likewise is difficult for me to understand why such an argument now relied upon by the Department in opposing S. 1356 also did not apply when the USDA recommended that the Farm Credit Administration be transferred out of the Department and established as an independent agency. Certainly credit is just as vital to agriculture as meat packing.

Mr. Chairman, because I believe it summarizes the problem very concisely, I should like to read a letter dated April 5, 1957, which I recently received in support of S. 1356 from Mr. Alden K. Barton, chairman of the Utah State Board of Agriculture. This State official, who is in an excellent position to evaluate title II administration in the field, writes as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I have reviewed Senate bill 1356 amending the antitrust laws relating to the meat-packing industry. I am in full accord with the statements you made before Congress in relation to fair-trade practices not being enforced by the Department of Agriculture and recommending that it could be efficiently handled under the Federal Trade Commission.

"It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture has had more to do with the stockyards division than they were staffed to handle and have not had the trained personnel to properly administer the fair-trade practices of the packers. There seems to be a feeling that packers can become monopolistic as they are endeavoring to go into other business such as livestock feeding and retail business to cover up some of the practices which would eliminate them from the laws that were intended to govern such practices.

"Another important practice which you mentioned is the chain stores going into the packing business in order to be exempt from the Federal Trade Commission supervision. It is felt by many that this is a bad practice and should be controlled. \* \* \* I know that the four large packers are opposed to your bill; that is evidence that they are fearful of having more rigid supervision from the Federal Trade Commission than they are now getting from the Department of Agriculture.

"If you would like my advice, I would certainly favor Senate bill 1356. I feel it will be beneficial to the livestock industry. I also feel that anything that can be done to

help the livestock industry should be the first order of business, under this high support program for basic commodities the livestock industry has suffered. I for one would like to do anything possible to help them out of the condition they are in at the present time. I have talked to several livestock men and they feel the same way that I have expressed myself to you.

"Hoping you are successful in getting this bill through the 85th Congress.

"Yours very respectfully,

"UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

"ALDEN K. BARTON,

"Commissioner of Agriculture."

But there is another basic reason why this authority to prevent unfair trade practices in the packing industry should be returned to the FTC, where Congress originally placed it. Because of 36 years of nonenforcement, title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act has never been fully litigated. The courts, therefore, have never been called upon to interpret the many and broad provisions which it contains. So from a practical standpoint, and in light of the seriousness of the situation, it might be several years before title II is fully litigated, so that effective action can be taken against alleged violators of the unfair trade practices provisions of that title.

In the meantime, if the national food chains and other food firms continue to acquire packing plants and thus escape FTC jurisdiction entirely, and the national packers concerned get out from under the consent decree, this situation would result:

1. A few large or giant firms would be able to set the prices received by producers not just of livestock products but a great many other farm products as well, and the prices paid by the consumer at the other end.

2. The same few giant concerns would be able to eliminate thousands of small businesses in all kinds of activities handling food products.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1957

Dr. Bob Jones, of Bob Jones University, Greenville, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for our country, for the liberties we enjoy, for the piety that has been handed down to us from the past. Help us to hand it on to our children. Help us to realize that life is not divided into the secular and the sacred, but that all ground is holy ground, every bush a burning bush, and every place a temple.

Help us to realize that all authority is given unto God, and that we all live under His directive or permissive will. Help us to so live.

Bless our country and all who have responsible positions, and help us to be faithful to Thee and to the purposes Thou dost have for our land.

We pray in the precious name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 1, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6304) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and

The Committee on Public Works, jointly; and

The Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills, the presentation of petitions and memorials, and the transaction of other routine business. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed a proposed order with the distinguished minority leader. It is agreeable to him for it to be brought up now. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of an order assigning my junior colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], to the committees in the Senate, and ask to have the clerk state the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the proposed order, as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That Mr. HENNINGS be excused from further service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

That Mr. YARBOROUGH be assigned to service on the following committees, namely: Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the order may be entered now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, all the morning newspapers carried headlines informing the country that the President may appeal to the people to support his budget.

In a very real sense that appeal will be welcome. It may help to clarify some of the confusion which has been caused by the conflicting statements of the President's Cabinet officers. I cannot help but wonder, however, whether these appeals are being addressed to the proper source. Instead of appealing to the people, it might be well for the President to appeal to the members of his official family, namely, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, and the distinguished Secretary of State.

If we are to accept as gospel the statements of our officials, Congress has already been placed in an impossible position. On the one hand, we are told that if we cut the budget, we will "breach the Nation's security." On the other hand, we are told that if we do not cut the budget, we will have a hair-curling depression. Congress has been told that whatever it does—cut or not cut—Congress will hurt the country. It is about time that the administration made up its mind, so that Congress can proceed to do a prudent job, free of conflicting pressures and varieties of propaganda.

Mr. President, it is rare that I pay tribute on the floor of the Senate to public officials. However, in my 25 years of experience in Washington, I have never seen a public official who I thought had done a more effective job of press relations than that performed by the distinguished press relations secretary of the President, Mr. Hagerty. If I were consulted about who should handle the information we send abroad, I believe I would call upon Mr. Hagerty so that he could employ his talents upon the rest of the world as well as he has in this country.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for the years 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature and increase the compensation of members of the legislature

"Whereas section 41 of the Hawaiian Organic Act provides for biennial sessions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, such section having been in effect since April 30, 1900; and

"Whereas subsequent to the enactment of the Hawaiian Organic Act the population of the Territory has more than tripled and it is now necessary for the legislature to meet annually for the proper and adequate consideration of governmental problems and determination of policy for the Territory; and

"Whereas the constitution of the state of Hawaii as agreed upon by the delegates of the people of Hawaii in convention on July 22, 1950, made provision for annual regular sessions of the legislature; and

"Whereas the compensation of members of the legislature has not been adjusted by the Congress since 1921: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 29th Legislature (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for annual regular sessions of the legislature as set forth in the constitution of the proposed state of Hawaii, and to increase the compensation of the members of the legislature as contemplated by section 17 of article XVI of said constitution, all as set forth in the form of bill for the enactment of which the legislature petitioned by Joint Resolution 3 of the session laws of Hawaii 1955; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution upon its adoption shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the House of Representatives of the 29th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

"G. VINCENT ESPOSITO,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"HERMAN P. F. LUM,

"Clerk, House of Representatives.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by

the Senate of the 29th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

"W. H. HEEN,

"President of the Senate.

"WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON,

"Clerk of the Senate."

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation granting to the State of New Mexico and the other Western States all of the lands and minerals within their respective borders with the exception of lands within national parks, national monuments, national forests, and lands utilized for national defense, and for the promotion of aviation and agriculture

"Whereas the people of New Mexico recognize that the United States of America owns over 45 percent of all the lands within the borders of New Mexico; and

"Whereas the people of New Mexico recognize that the United States of America owns a large proportion of the Western States as tabulated below:

	Percent
"Arizona.....	69
California.....	45
Colorado.....	37
Idaho.....	64
Montana.....	36
Nevada.....	84
New Mexico.....	45
North Dakota.....	6
Oklahoma.....	8
Oregon.....	52
South Dakota.....	17
Utah.....	71
Washington.....	35
Wyoming.....	51

"and

"Whereas the people of New Mexico have long been aware of the inequitable lack of sovereignty and loss of revenue from the lands aforesaid and minerals contained therein; and

"Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 in its preamble states that its purpose is 'to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal'; and

"Whereas by the several acts of admission of the Western States enumerated above each State was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, which is not the case in fact when the Federal Government owns the majority of the lands within the said Western States and the minerals contained therein; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has from time to time taken and continues to take more of the lands and minerals in addition to those already owned by it within the Western States, and thus deprives New Mexico and its citizens, and deprives the other Western States and their citizens further from the benefits of such lands and minerals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to grant to New Mexico and its citizens, and to the other Western States and their citizens, title to all of the lands and minerals presently owned by the Government of the United States within the borders of New Mexico and of the other Western States, with the exception of lands in use, or needed in the immediate future for use, in the discharge of governmental functions, and of lands and minerals in national parks, national monuments, na-



tional forests, and of lands for national defense and for promotion of aviation and agriculture; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President and to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,

"President, Senate.

"GRACE MCAFFEE,

"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"Approved by me this 22d day of March 1957.

"E. L. MECHEM,

"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 17

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congressional delegation of New Mexico and Arizona to exert their efforts on behalf of the establishment and construction of a flood-control and irrigation dam on the San Francisco River at the proposed Frisco Dam site, Reserve, N. Mex.

"Whereas the establishment and construction of a flood-control and irrigation dam at the Frisco Dam site on the San Francisco River in southwestern New Mexico would serve a multifold purpose; and

"Whereas the establishment and construction of the proposed dam would prevent the recurrence of floods such as those of 1941 and 1949 that seriously damaged areas of Reserve, Alma, Glenwood, and Pleasanton in New Mexico and Clifton in Arizona, and many acres of valuable farmland along the banks of the Frisco and Gila Rivers; and

"Whereas the controlled irrigation of such areas would be of untold benefit as the Frisco River in such areas practically dries up during the late summer months when the water is needed the most; and

"Whereas if the dam is constructed at the proposed site on the Frisco River, known as the Frisco Dam site, the costs would be relatively small due to the height of the rock walls bounding the river and the narrowness of the river canyon at this point; and

"Whereas if the dam is constructed at the proposed site, the people of the State of Arizona will cooperate with and welcome such construction as it will be of untold value to many of their citizens; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congressional delegation of New Mexico and Arizona be hereby memorialized earnestly to exert their efforts on behalf of the establishment and construction of a flood-control dam at the Frisco Dam site on the San Francisco River at Reserve, N. Mex.; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to each member of the Congressional delegation of New Mexico and Arizona.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,

"President, Senate.

"GRACE MCAFFEE,

"Chief Clerk, Senate."

#### WHY POLAND SHOULD BE HELPED— STATEMENT BY POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a statement by

CWI—394

the Polish American Congress entitled "Why Poland Should Be Helped." On this day, 166 years ago, Poland enacted one of the first European democratic constitutions. We nations in the free world now have the opportunity to do something to assist in the attempt of freedom-loving Poles to regain the rights and liberties guaranteed by that constitution. The statement is especially fitting, for the past year saw the struggle for freedom from Communist tyranny so clearly manifested in Poznan. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHY POLAND SHOULD BE HELPED, A STATEMENT BY THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

Since the October upheaval in Warsaw, when, in the wave of unrest and discontent of the population, Polish Communists recognized the urgency of needed economic and political reforms, American sympathy for Poland has been growing rapidly. From humanitarian and, to some extent, diplomatic views, at least 90 percent of American press and radio and television commentators favor technical and economic help for Poland. However, in this gratifying wave of sympathy for the Polish people, a sense of apprehension could be detected. One question is being frequently asked—whether, while helping Poland we would at the same time strengthen the Soviet Union and communism?

The answer to this question is an emphatic "No" for the following reasons:

1. The Polish people are painfully aware of the fact that Communist concepts of economy and industrial planning have brought them to the brink of disaster. The Communists themselves accepted this truth by retreating from such spheres of economic activities as the collectivization of farms which has been brought to a standstill, and complete socialization of small private enterprises which has been abandoned.

These two examples prove beyond doubt that the Polish people have forced Communists to a considerable retreat from stubborn entrenchment in Marxist-Leninist theories and practices. And this is only the beginning. Given more time, and moral as well as material support, the Poles will eventually go farther on the road to complete independence.

2. Polish national interests, historic evolution as well as cultural and spiritual ties with Western civilization clash with Communist designs for world domination. Polish implacable hostility toward communism in general and toward Russian colonialism in particular is a proven fact of history.

There is no danger—that by helping Poland economically we would be strengthening communism and the Soviet Union. On the contrary, stronger and more independent Poland would mean a gradual retreat of communism in Central and East Europe and would effectively oppose Russian designs for conquest.

Another argument is being set forth even by people whose sympathy toward Poland is sincere, that there is a great risk involved in helping the Polish people now. They say that American aid for Poland would provoke Russian wrath against the Poles. They add that the Polish people have already aroused Russian antagonism to a breaking point.

Let us bear in mind, therefore, that the Poles are well aware of the risk. They are willing to take it. The very fact that they asked us for help instead of begging the

Kremlin for handouts, proves beyond doubt that Poland wants to return to the Western family of nations where her national birth placed her a thousand years ago. The Poles have already taken a risk by turning to the West. It should be evaluated as a calculated risk. They are risking far more in turning to us than we are risking in granting them help.

The stakes are high and worth the chance both for Poland and for the United States. In the long view of history, the Communist system of government forced on Poland by the might of the Russian Army is only transitory. Poland as a nation successfully opposed Russification in the past and, with her boundless devotion to freedom and democracy, will emerge victorious from Communist oppression. But she needs our help and fully deserves to be helped in her hour of dire need.

Finally, some aspects of Poland's foreign policy are being used in arguments against a large scale help. We should remember that Poland's current foreign policy is not of her own choice. It has been linked to Russia with full consent and support of the Western Powers at Yalta. Poland is not yet able to follow an independent course in foreign affairs. This can develop only in accordance with the amount of material and moral help that Poland could get from the West.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Eisenhower Regular Republican Club of the 14th Assembly District East, New York City, commending President Eisenhower for his concern for civil rights and firm action in seeking to abolish prejudice and urging increased and widespread support for the President's civil-rights program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EISENHOWER REGULAR REPUBLICAN CLUB,

New York, N. Y., April 5, 1957.

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has again and again demonstrated his dedication to the cause of equality and justice for all; and

Whereas genuine democracy cannot exist unless every American is assured of his constitutional rights and of freedom of intimidation and violence in the exercise of these rights; and

Whereas courageous Negro and white citizens in some areas of our Nation have been subjected to repeated acts of intimidation and violence aimed at crushing all efforts to promote equality and understanding among our people; and

Whereas individuals have been killed and injured, and property, including churches, has been severely damaged by the enemies of decent Americans everywhere: Be it

Resolved by the members of the Eisenhower Regular Republican Club, Inc. (Regular Organization)—

1. That we commend our President for his consistent record of concern for civil rights and his firm action in abolishing discrimination and segregation wherever Federal law has jurisdiction.

2. That we strongly endorse the President's civil-rights program and urge all Americans to support it with increased vigor against the determined opposition of most Democratic leaders.

3. That we call upon our President to encourage and strengthen the forces seeking

justice everywhere by speaking out boldly against organized violence that has afflicted parts of our land.

4. That copies of this letter be sent to the President, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Senators of the State of New York.

5. That other Republican organizations in the New York City area be urged to adopt similar resolutions.

Adopted unanimously, April 2, 1957, business meeting.

ELLEN BENN,  
Executive Member,  
S. B. PETERSON,  
President,  
ISABEL VERDEJO,  
Recording Secretary.

#### ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL—RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Daughters of the American Revolution in the recent national congress held in this city, endorsing the purpose and program of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL

Whereas the President of the United States of America has issued a proclamation directing that the year 1957 bring appropriate observance by "all officials and agencies of Federal Government, and all citizens," and has urged upon the governors of the several States that they do honor to the memory of Alexander Hamilton during this bicentennial year, "with appropriate activities and ceremonies commemorative of his inspiring role in our national life": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in keeping with its historic role of honoring the memory of the heroic founders of this Nation, hereby declares its wholehearted cooperation in appropriate ceremonies commemorative of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America.

#### RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REFRIGERATED WAREHOUSES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the 66th annual meeting of the National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, at Atlantic City, last month, relating to Federal taxation and spending.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the proposed Federal budget continues the ruinous course established by the New Deal and Fair Deal of tremendous Federal spending and continued high level of taxes; and whereas such spending and taxing will ultimately result in destruction of America's free enterprise economic system and democratic political structure; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That our public refrigerated warehouse industry again warns the Nation of this great danger and prays Congress to

make every effort to make reductions in the proposed Federal budget that will make possible later tax reductions without reverting to deficit spending.

#### ENDING THE "NO-MAN'S LAND" IN LABOR RELATIONS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive this morning a splendid letter from the secretary of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.

Arvid Anderson described an important meeting which had been held in Madison at the end of last month designed to cope with the problem of what has been well described as a most regrettable "no-man's land" in the field of labor relations.

I mean an area where the State employment relations agencies unfortunately may not regulate labor disputes, despite the fact that, at the Federal level, the National Labor Relations Board has declined to exercise jurisdiction over such disputes.

I have previously commented on this subject, because I regard it as extremely significant.

We must end the "no-man's land." We must enable the State agencies to handle State problems at the State level.

We must not permit confusion and uncertainty to continue in the ranks of labor, management, and among the State officials who have to do the job at the grassroots.

I am pleased that there has now been formed a permanent organization of State labor relations agencies.

I present Mr. Anderson's letter, together with a copy of a resolution which has been adopted by this organization.

I commend the resolution to my colleagues. I am not a member of the Senate Labor Committee which handles items of this nature, but I earnestly hope that the committee will consider this matter at its earliest possible convenience.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,  
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD,  
Madison, Wis., April 30, 1957.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: This is to advise you of the results of the April 23 and 24, 1957, conference in Madison, Wis., called for the purpose of considering the impact of the "no-man's land" decision in the field of labor relations.

At this meeting a permanent organization of State labor relations agencies was organized and the enclosed resolution was unanimously adopted. It was the viewpoint of all present that Congress should accept the invitation of the United States Supreme Court to adopt legislation designed to eliminate the no-man's land in which labor disputes arise and over which the States have no power to regulate even though the National Labor Relations Board, for budgetary and other reasons, refuses to act.

We sincerely hope that you and the other members of the Wisconsin Congressional

delegation will use your best efforts to support legislation which will afford some relief from the intolerable no-man's land in which many employers and employees now find themselves.

While no specific measure was endorsed by the association, it is the viewpoint of Chairman L. E. Gooding and the board members that either the bill proposed by Senator Ives or Senator WATKINS merits support.

Sincerely yours,

ARVID ANDERSON,  
Secretary, Association of State Labor Relations Agencies.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE LABOR RELATIONS AGENCIES ON APRIL 24, 1957, IN MEETING AT MADISON, WIS.

Whereas the National Labor Relations Board, acting pursuant to powers granted to it by the Congress of the United States, has established jurisdictional standards under which it declines to exercise jurisdiction over many labor disputes affecting interstate commerce on the ground that such disputes are predominantly local in character; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on March 25, 1957, held that the States may not regulate labor disputes affecting interstate commerce, even though the National Labor Relations Board has declined to exercise jurisdiction over such disputes; and

Whereas the aforesaid decisions of the United States Supreme Court result in the creation of a vast area in which thousands of labor disputes are or will be wholly unregulated and the parties thereto deprived of any forum and remedy; and

Whereas the existence of such an area of unregulated labor relations is inimical to the health, safety, welfare, prosperity, and well-being of the several States and their citizens; and

Whereas the United States Supreme Court, in its aforesaid decisions has stated that the remedy for this situation lies with the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, it is hereby

*Resolved by the Association of State Labor Relations Agencies*, That the unfortunate situation above described requires immediate and appropriate remedial action by the Congress of the United States; and it is further

*Resolved*, That the officers of the association be and they hereby are directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to the chairman and members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Secretary of Labor, and to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1463. A bill to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle subject to the motor carrier safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission (Rept. No. 283);

S. 1491. A bill to revise the Transportation of Explosives Act, chapter 39, title 18, of the United States Code, as amended (Rept. No. 281); and

S. 1492. A bill to provide more adequate and realistic penalties for violations of certain statutes administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission (Rept. No. 282).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. Res. 125. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of



methods of providing an overall feed program (Rept. No. 284).

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he reported the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1859. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Gold Rush 1957 Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 285).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 1544. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga. (Rept. No. 286).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 405. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm (Rept. No. 287).

#### STUDY OF METHODS OF PROVIDING AN OVERALL FEED PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably, with amendments, the resolution (S. Res. 125) re-

questing the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of methods of providing an overall feed program, and I submit a report (No. 284) thereon.

This resolution requests the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a thorough study of possible methods of improving the feed grain program. The report, due on July 15, 1957, shall include drafts of any legislation considered necessary to carry out such recommendations.

In submitting this resolution on April 15, I expressed hope that we could study the recommendations and be ready to take any necessary action early next session.

An overall feed grain program is sorely needed. Representatives from all the major farm organizations have emphasized that it is necessary to bring the total feed grain supply into better balance with demand.

Legislation that deals with only one of the feed grains can never achieve this goal.

The USDA stocks of grains report of April 24 states:

Stocks of feed grains—corn, oats and barley—add to a total of nearly 85 million tons—the largest in the 15 years for which comparable data are available.

Should this condition continue, it can only mean disastrously low livestock prices.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge prompt action on this resolution, so that the Department of Agriculture can immediately begin studying this problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

#### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of March 1957. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH 1957 AND FEBRUARY 1957, AND PAY, FEBRUARY 1957 AND JANUARY 1957

##### PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

Information in monthly personnel reports for March 1957 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total <sup>1</sup>	2,392,987	2,390,517	+2,470	\$847,617	\$980,594	—\$141,977
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,224,925	1,218,303	+6,622	425,756	512,459	—86,703
Department of Defense	1,168,062	1,172,214	—4,152	421,861	477,135	—55,274
Inside continental United States	2,188,431	2,185,279	+3,152	—	—	—
Outside continental United States	204,556	205,238	—682	—	—	—
Industrial employment	657,303	658,000	—697	—	—	—
Foreign nationals	271,578	272,516	—938	27,172	28,086	—914

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I, below, breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II, page 5, breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III, page 7, breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV, page 8, breaks down the above

employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V, page 9, shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957, and pay for February 1957, and comparison with January 1957

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	83,341	82,180	1,161	—	\$26,650	\$30,079	—	\$3,429
Commerce <sup>1</sup>	48,020	47,335	685	—	19,706	22,565	—	2,859
Health, Education, and Welfare	51,288	50,569	719	—	19,958	20,597	—	639
Interior	50,263	49,649	614	—	18,939	21,409	—	2,470
Justice	30,652	30,797	—145	—	13,916	15,823	—	1,907
Labor	5,942	5,929	13	—	2,508	2,843	—	335
Post Office	524,347	522,908	1,439	—	173,970	228,354	—	54,384
State <sup>2</sup>	33,384	33,056	328	—	11,620	12,912	—	1,292
Treasury	82,789	81,070	1,719	—	31,827	35,854	—	4,027
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	399	401	—2	—	213	244	—	31
Bureau of the Budget	437	446	—9	—	270	322	—	52
Council of Economic Advisers	28	29	—1	—	21	29	—	8
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	70	—1	—	26	27	—	1
National Security Council <sup>3</sup>	27	26	1	—	17	19	—	2
Office of Defense Mobilization	270	263	7	—	167	167	—	—
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5	—	—	2	3	—	1

<sup>1</sup> March figure includes 274 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

<sup>2</sup> Revised on the basis of later information.

<sup>3</sup> March figure includes 11,026 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 10,842 in February and their pay. These ICA figures

include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 2,642 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 2,585.

<sup>4</sup> Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957, and pay for February 1957, and comparison with January 1957—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
<b>Independent agencies:</b>								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control.....	14	8	6	-----	\$4	\$4	-----	-----
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.....	11	12	-----	1	6	7	-----	1
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	609	602	7	-----	85	94	-----	9
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,709	6,717	-----	8	3,281	3,734	-----	453
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	581	582	-----	1	278	319	-----	41
Boston National Historic Sites Commission.....	5	5	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	597	598	-----	1	316	364	-----	48
Civil Service Commission.....	4,420	4,439	-----	19	1,887	2,138	-----	251
Commission of Fine Arts.....	4	4	-----	-----	2	2	-----	-----
Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.....	2	2	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----
District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.....	18	18	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	189	189	-----	-----	109	125	-----	16
Farm Credit Administration.....	953	959	-----	6	467	535	-----	68
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	1,177	1,167	10	-----	585	667	-----	82
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	7	7	-----	-----	5	4	\$1	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,161	1,160	1	-----	565	644	-----	79
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,122	1,143	-----	21	531	600	-----	69
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	721	716	5	-----	318	356	-----	38
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	336	340	-----	4	223	246	-----	23
Federal Power Commission.....	711	707	4	-----	363	406	-----	43
Federal Trade Commission.....	744	734	10	-----	377	440	-----	63
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	116	116	-----	-----	56	61	-----	5
General Accounting Office.....	5,368	5,373	-----	5	2,310	2,671	-----	361
General Services Administration.....	27,483	27,404	79	-----	9,202	10,686	-----	1,484
Government Contract Commission.....	21	21	-----	-----	10	10	-----	-----
Government Printing Office.....	6,467	6,490	-----	23	2,708	3,252	-----	544
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	9,983	9,964	19	-----	4,458	5,107	-----	649
Indian Claims Commission.....	14	14	-----	-----	10	11	-----	1
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,146	2,150	-----	4	1,013	1,148	-----	135
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.....	4	4	-----	-----	2	3	-----	1
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,721	7,713	8	-----	3,571	4,109	-----	538
National Capital Housing Authority.....	250	252	-----	2	90	105	-----	15
National Capital Planning Commission.....	30	36	-----	6	16	20	-----	4
National Gallery of Art.....	331	332	-----	1	103	\$115	-----	12
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,130	1,137	-----	7	595	671	-----	76
National Mediation Board.....	111	111	-----	-----	68	84	-----	16
National Science Foundation.....	308	281	27	-----	125	148	-----	23
National Security Training Commission.....	6	6	-----	-----	2	3	-----	1
Panama Canal.....	14,101	14,133	-----	32	3,573	3,656	-----	83
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,349	2,342	7	-----	845	958	-----	113
Renegotiation Board.....	417	431	-----	14	254	293	-----	39
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	35	35	-----	-----	22	24	-----	2
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	786	785	1	-----	402	462	-----	60
Selective Service System.....	6,996	6,969	27	-----	1,607	1,845	-----	238
Small Business Administration.....	1,049	1,024	25	-----	495	555	-----	60
Smithsonian Institution.....	771	762	9	-----	270	314	-----	44
Soldiers' Home.....	1,017	1,020	-----	3	225	261	-----	36
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	36	31	5	-----	21	23	-----	2
Tariff Commission.....	216	213	3	-----	118	131	-----	13
Tax Court of the United States.....	141	144	-----	3	89	105	-----	16
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	15,147	14,903	244	-----	6,220	7,138	-----	918
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission.....	4	4	-----	-----	2	2	-----	-----
U. S. Information Agency.....	11,783	11,718	65	-----	3,057	3,467	-----	410
Veterans' Administration.....	177,232	177,539	-----	307	55,001	63,084	-----	8,083
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.....	4	4	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,224,925	1,218,303	7,248	626	425,756	512,459	\$1	86,704
Net change, excluding Department of Defense.....	-----	-----	6,622	-----	-----	-----	86,703	-----
<b>Department of Defense:</b>								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,700	1,692	8	-----	1,070	1,095	-----	25
Department of the Army.....	428,357	428,717	-----	360	150,453	169,161	-----	18,708
Department of the Navy.....	391,939	393,136	-----	1,197	150,630	168,967	-----	18,337
Department of the Air Force.....	346,068	348,669	-----	2,603	119,708	137,912	-----	18,204
Total, Department of Defense.....	1,168,062	1,172,214	8	4,160	421,861	477,135	-----	55,274
Net decrease, Department of Defense.....	-----	-----	4,152	-----	-----	-----	55,274	-----
Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,392,987	2,390,517	7,256	4,786	847,617	989,594	1	141,978
Net change, including Department of Defense.....	-----	-----	2,470	-----	-----	-----	141,977	-----

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>									
Agriculture.....	82,023	80,991	1,032	-----	Advisory Committee on Weather Control.....	14	8	6	-----
Commerce.....	44,321	43,702	619	-----	Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.....	11	12	-----	1
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	49,459	48,737	722	-----	American Battle Monuments Commission.....	17	18	-----	1
Interior.....	46,010	45,398	612	-----	Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,689	6,697	-----	8
Justice.....	30,115	30,262	-----	147	Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	581	582	-----	1
Labor.....	5,827	5,810	17	-----	Boston National Historic Sites Commission.....	5	5	-----	-----
Post Office.....	521,868	520,433	1,435	-----	Civil Aeronautics Board.....	593	593	-----	-----
State.....	8,580	8,528	52	-----	Civil Service Commission.....	4,404	4,423	-----	19
Treasury.....	81,783	80,080	1,703	-----	Commission of Fine Arts.....	4	4	-----	-----
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>									
White House Office.....	399	401	-----	2	Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.....	2	2	-----	-----
Bureau of the Budget.....	437	446	-----	9	District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.....	18	18	-----	-----
Council of Economic Advisors.....	28	29	-----	1	Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	189	189	-----	-----
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	69	70	-----	1	Farm Credit Administration.....	944	950	-----	6
National Security Council.....	27	26	1	-----	Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	1,177	1,167	10	-----
Office of Defense Mobilization.....	270	263	7	-----	Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	7	7	-----	-----
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.....	5	5	-----	-----					

<sup>1</sup> March figure includes 274 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.  
<sup>2</sup> March figure includes 1,722 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,727 in February.

<sup>3</sup> Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.



TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957—Continued

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>					<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>				
Federal Communications Commission	1,134	1,134			Small Business Administration	1,040	1,016	24	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,120	1,141		21	Smithsonian Institution	769	760	9	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	721	716	5		Soldiers' Home	1,017	1,020		3
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	336	340		4	Subversive Activities Control Board	36	31	5	
Federal Power Commission	711	707	4		Tariff Commission	216	213	3	
Federal Trade Commission	744	734	10		Tax Court of the United States	141	144		3
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	116	116			Tennessee Valley Authority	15,147	14,903	244	
General Accounting Office	5,294	5,296		2	Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	4	4		
General Services Administration	27,380	27,301	79		United States Information Agency	2,763	2,716	47	
Government Printing Office	21	21			Veterans' Administration	175,981	176,293		312
Housing and Home Finance Agency	9,817	9,800	17		Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	4	4		
Indian Claims Commission	14	14							
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,146	2,150		4	Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,159,698	1,153,555	6,141	598
Jamestown-Williamsburg Yorktown Celebration Commission	4	4			Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,143	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,721	7,713	8						
National Capital Housing Authority	250	252		2	<b>Department of Defense:</b>				
National Capital Planning Commission	30	36		6	Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,653	1,648	5	
National Gallery of Art	331	332		1	Department of the Army	364,990	365,194		204
National Labor Relations Board	1,112	1,119		7	Department of the Navy	358,868	360,059		1,191
National Mediation Board	111	111			Department of the Air Force	303,222	304,823		1,601
National Science Foundation	308	281	27		Total, Department of Defense	1,028,733	1,031,724	5	2,996
National Security Training Commission	6	6			Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,991	
Panama Canal	422	412	10						
Railroad Retirement Board	2,349	2,342	7		<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense</b>	<b>2,188,431</b>	<b>2,185,279</b>	<b>6,746</b>	<b>3,504</b>
Renegotiation Board	417	431		14	<b>Net increase, including Department of Defense</b>			<b>3,152</b>	
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	35	35							
Securities and Exchange Commission	786	785	1						
Selective Service System	6,801	6,776	25						

\* Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>					<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>				
Agriculture	1,318	1,189	129		Selective Service System	195	193	2	
Commerce	3,699	3,633	66		Small Business Administration	9	8	1	
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,829	1,832		3	Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
Interior	4,253	4,251	2		United States Information Agency	9,020	9,002	18	
Justice	537	535	2		Veterans' Administration	1,251	1,246	5	
Labor	115	119		4	Total, excluding Department of Defense	65,227	64,748	532	53
Post Office	2,479	2,475	4		Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			479	
State	24,804	24,528	276						
Treasury	1,006	990	16		<b>Department of Defense:</b>				
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					Office of the Secretary of Defense	47	44	3	
American Battle Monuments Commission	592	584	8		Department of the Army	63,367	63,523		156
Atomic Energy Commission	20	20			Department of the Navy	33,071	33,077		6
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	5		1	Department of the Air Force	42,844	43,846		1,002
Civil Service Commission	16	16			Total, Department of Defense	139,329	140,490	3	1,161
Farm Credit Administration	9	9			Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,161	
Federal Communications Commission	27	26	1						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2			<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense</b>	<b>204,556</b>	<b>205,238</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>1,217</b>
General Accounting Office	74	77		3	<b>Net decrease, including Department of Defense</b>			<b>682</b>	
General Services Administration	103	103							
Housing and Home Finance Agency	166	164	2						
National Labor Relations Board	18	18							
Panama Canal	13,679	13,721		42					

<sup>1</sup> March figure includes 9,304 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 9,115 in February. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust

fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 2,643 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 2,585.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1957, and comparison with February 1957

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>					<b>Department of Defense:</b>				
Agriculture	3,150	3,011	139		Department of the Army:				
Commerce	2,739	2,676	63		Inside continental United States	181,700	181,799		99
Health, Education, and Welfare	8,263	8,200	63		Outside continental United States	22,625	22,688		63
Interior	5,644	5,638	6		Department of the Navy:				
Treasury	145	146		1	Inside continental United States	220,338	221,200		862
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					Outside continental United States	5,995	6,027		32
Atomic Energy Commission	13	14		1	Department of the Air Force:				
Federal Communications Commission	1,090	1,117		27	Inside continental United States	165,117	165,265		148
General Services Administration	6,467	6,490		20	Outside continental United States	6,635	6,592	43	
Government Printing Office	7,721	7,713	8		Total Department of Defense	602,410	603,571	43	1,204
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,272	7,262	10		Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,161	
Panama Canal	12,389	12,162	227						
Tennessee Valley Authority					<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense</b>	<b>657,303</b>	<b>658,000</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>1,256</b>
Total, excluding Department of Defense	54,893	54,429	516	52	<b>Net decrease, including Department of Defense</b>			<b>697</b>	
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			464						

\* Subject to revision.

\* Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1957 and comparison with February 1957

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Belgium.....	6						6	
England.....	7,533	7,941					7,495	7,904
France.....	26,100	26,051	18,231	18,104	37	37	7,869	7,947
French Morocco.....	5,818	6,137	180	164	951	1,001	4,707	4,972
Germany.....	98,463	98,757	82,358	82,626	543	555	15,562	15,576
Japan.....	128,030	127,884	66,752	66,293	19,235	19,408	42,043	42,183
Korea.....	4,922	5,040	4,922	5,040				
Malta.....	90	94			90	94		
Netherlands.....	41	39					41	39
Norway.....	25	23					25	23
Trinidad.....	550	550			550	550		
Total.....	271,578	272,516	172,423	172,227	21,406	21,645	77,749	78,644

<sup>1</sup> Revised on the basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments.

The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

#### FOREIGN NATIONALS

Table 5 segregates and accounts for certain categories of personal services rendered to the United States Government overseas which cannot be regarded as ordinary direct employment.

Generally this personal service is rendered military agencies overseas under agreements with the foreign governments. In most cases the employment is indirect. The foreign governments hire the employees. The United States military agencies in most cases administer or direct the activity.

The source of the funds for the payment of these employees varies. The Germans are employed without direct reimbursement by the United States, and by agreement payment is made from the German economy. The Japanese are employed under a master labor contract between United States agencies and the Japanese Government.

French and English are employed for the Army and Air Force under agreements with the respective Governments. Funds originally appropriated for "Personal service" are used for this purpose. The Koreans and others are paid under varying contractual agreements with funds appropriated for "Other contractual services."

Personnel hired and used under such circumstances cannot be properly considered in the same category as regular employment, but they are used and should be counted for what they are.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is endeavoring to identify these groups of employees and to count them along with, but separate from, the regularly reported United States employment overseas.

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD EMPLOYEES

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,392,987. This was a net increase of 2,470 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1957, which began July 1, 1956, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July.....	2,398,673	14,250	
August.....	2,400,493	1,820	
September.....	2,388,854		11,639
October.....	2,396,163	7,309	
November.....	2,394,324		1,839
December.....	2,389,788		4,536
January 1957.....	2,387,015		2,773
February.....	2,390,517	3,502	
March.....	2,392,987	2,470	

Total civilian employment in civilian agencies during the month of March was 1,224,925,

an increase of 6,622 as compared with the February total of 1,218,303. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,168,062, a decrease of 4,152 as compared with 1,172,214 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the major increases were Treasury Department with 1,719, Post Office Department with 1,439, Agriculture Department with 1,161, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 719, Department of the Interior with 614, and Department of Commerce with 685. The increases in the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Treasury were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Air Force with 2,603, the Department of the Navy with 1,197, and the Department of the Army with 360.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 3,152 and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 632. Industrial employment by the Federal agencies in March totaled 657,303, a decrease of 697.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

#### PAYROLL

The regular monthly Federal civilian payroll in February totaled \$847,617,000. United States pay for foreign nationals working under Federal agencies abroad totaled \$16,163,000. The total February payroll for agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government was \$863,780.

The total for January was \$1 billion. Despite an increase in employment the February payroll was \$142,514,000 less than the January total. A number of factors contribute to such a situation. For example, February was a short month.

These figures for the month were certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Payroll figures are on an actual basis and necessarily lag 1 month behind the personnel count.

Payroll for the first 8 months of fiscal year 1957, including United States funds for foreign nationals not on regular rolls, totaled \$7.5 billion. This was a monthly average of \$936 million, since the fiscal year started July 1, 1956.

These payroll figures by months follow:

(In millions of dollars)

Month	Regular payrolls	Foreign nationals not on regular rolls (United States funds)	Total
July.....	907	17	923
August.....	950	17	967

(In millions of dollars—Continued)

Month	Regular payrolls	Foreign nationals not on regular rolls (United States funds)	Total
September.....	846	17	863
October.....	847	17	864
November.....	831	17	848
December.....	933	18	951
January 1957.....	990	17	1,006
February.....	848	16	864
Total (8 months).....	7,351	136	7,487

#### FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,392,987 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 271,578 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies during March who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in February was 272,516. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Belgium.....	6			6
England.....	7,533		37	7,496
France.....	26,100	18,231		7,869
French Morocco.....	5,818	160	951	4,707
Germany.....	98,463	82,358	543	15,562
Japan.....	128,030	66,752	19,235	42,043
Korea.....	4,922	4,922		
Malta.....	90		90	
Netherlands.....	41			41
Norway.....	25			25
Trinidad.....	550		550	
Total.....	271,578	172,423	21,406	77,749

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry J. Taylor, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Switzerland; and

Scott McLeod, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ireland.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I re-



port favorably the nominations of three lieutenant generals in the Army to be retired and the nominations of a small group of general officers for appointment and promotion in the Army and Army Reserves. This group includes the name of Maj. Gen. Andrew Thomas McNamara for appointment as the Quartermaster General of the Army. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army); Lt. Gen. Alonzo Patrick Fox, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army); and Lt. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army); to be placed on the retired list.

Maj. Gen. Paul Irwin Robinson, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas North, United States Army, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in addition, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of approximately 4,700 nominations for appointments in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, in the grade of commander and below. These names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Quincy E. Fortier, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

William A. Abbott, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1957. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Isaac Levy and his wife, Mireille Levy;

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Edward Noonan; and

S. 1959. A bill for the relief of Ahamed Meah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Balz Ruzic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1961. A bill for the relief of Maria Van Arendonk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1962. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain tract of land owned by the United States to the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, Bowie, Md.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1963. A bill to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to increase the punishment for knowingly giving false information concerning destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles; and

S. 1964. A bill for the relief of Juana Maria Geldrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1965. A bill for the relief of Sotiris Lambriris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1966. A bill for the relief of Blase Conte; S. 1967. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Bongiovanni; and

S. 1968. A bill for the relief of Ambrose Pitter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1969. A bill to continue availability of funds for surveys and planning under title VI of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Karl Hirofumi Eldmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1971. A bill to amend sections 4 (a) and 7 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1972. A bill for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini; and

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of Maria Begonia Lamana Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Bruce Schmedemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of Peder Strand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1976. A bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes;

S. 1977. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes; and

S. 1978. A bill to authorize the imposition of forfeitures not exceeding \$100 for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special services fields; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Barbara Hollinger;

S. 1980. A bill for the relief of the Acme Bronze Co.; and

S. 1981. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain payments for the relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1982. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue bonds to finance a school-construction program in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1983. A bill to amend the law relating to the limitation of liability on vessels in order to provide that the owner's interest in

certain insurance be included in such liability; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1984. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1985. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRIDGES,

Mr. BUSH, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1986. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1988. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces without regard to the dependence of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1989. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reynard R. Addleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1990. A bill for the relief of Agnes Nina Coll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to certain citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE TO REPRESENT CONGRESS AT 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF JAMESTOWN, VA.

Mr. BYRD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That a joint committee consisting of 4 Senators and 5 Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to represent the Congress of the United States at the ceremonies to be held at Jamestown, Va., on July 30, 1957, in commemoration of the 350th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in America. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

*Resolved further.* That the necessary expenses of such committee, which shall not exceed \$——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman.

# PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INCREASED IN- DUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 131), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the interim report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, submitted to the Congress April 17, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

## AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. On behalf of myself, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This bill is part of the legislative program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and would increase from 2 to 3 years the maximum period during which any one individual could receive assistance for training in physical medicine and rehabilitation.

Certification in physical medicine and rehabilitation requires a minimum of 3 years of specialized training beyond the doctor of medicine degree, and as a result the present limitation of 2 years in this field is hindering the progress of the traineeship program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with the letter of transmittal, dated April 19, from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, addressed to the President of the Senate, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1971) to amend sections 4 (a) and 7 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second sentence of section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U. S. C. 34 (a)) is amended by adding the following immediately before the period; "except that, in the case of a course of study in physical medicine and rehabilitation, such period may not be in excess of 3 years."

Sec. 2. Clause (3) of section 7 (a) of such act (29 U. S. C. 37 (a)) is amended by striking out "for any one course of study for a period in excess of 2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "for any one course of study, other than a course of study in physical medicine and rehabilitation, for a period in excess of 2 years, or for a course of study in physical medicine and rehabilitation for a period in excess of 3 years."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this act shall become effective July 1, 1957.

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
April 19, 1957.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting for your consideration a legislative proposal to amend sections 4 (a) and 7 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U. S. C., ch. 4) so as to extend from 2 to 3 years the maximum period during which this Department may assist in furnishing any one individual with training in physical medicine and rehabilitation. These sections of the act, which authorize Federal support of training and traineeships for rehabilitation personnel, currently provide that the Secretary shall make no grant for "furnishing to an individual any one course of study extending for a period in excess of 2 years" (sec. 4 (a)), and that the Secretary shall provide no training or instruction (or fellowship or scholarship) to "any individual for any one course of study for a period in excess of 2 years" (sec. 7 (a)).

Certification in physical medicine and rehabilitation requires a minimum of 3 years of specialized training beyond the doctor of medicine degree. No other Federal law authorizing Federal support of training in a medical specialty contains a 2-year statutory limitation on traineeships. The effect of this limitation is to hamper accomplishment of one of the key objectives of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

On an average day there are in the United States about 4 million noninstitutionalized persons with long-term disability. One of the greatest single obstacles to the more rapid provision of rehabilitation services to disabled people is the acute shortage of physicians trained in rehabilitation. This shortage promises to remain as a serious stumbling block unless the number of doctors receiving such training is substantially increased. The number of physicians certified by the American Specialty Board of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation totals about 300, with an annual increment in the past few years of about 25. It is for this reason that, since 1951, the Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has regularly listed physical medicine and rehabilitation as one of the medical specialties in which there are acute shortages.

The training provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act were included to help promote a rapid and substantial increase in the supply of trained rehabilitation personnel. The statutory 2-year limitation on traineeships for rehabilitation training in medicine is substantially hindering the achievement of that objective, since the physiatrist (specialist in physical medicine and rehabilitation) is a key member of the professional team providing rehabilitation services to disabled persons.

As a new specialty, physical medicine and rehabilitation must compete for physicians with older medical specialties such as internal medicine, orthopedics, and neurology. Young doctors frequently decide to enter another medical specialty where support is obtainable for the complete course when they learn that only 2 of the required 3 years of training in physical medicine and rehabilitation is available for vocational rehabilitation traineeships. Doctors deciding to specialize in physical medicine and rehabilitation are faced with the special problem of finding other ways and means of financing a third year which this Department, through its Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is, under existing provisions of law, unable to support. At the present time there are six young physicians in their second year of vocational rehabilitation traineeships who require 1

more year of training after their traineeships expire on June 30, 1957. In addition, there are 17 first-year residents who, in order to complete their eligibility requirements for Board certification, will need 2 further years of training, only 1 of which can be supported by funds appropriated under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

This amendment will not involve any increase in costs beyond those contemplated for the normal growth of the training program. However, the contribution which these crucially needed, trained specialists will make in advancing rehabilitation programs and services to communities throughout the Nation is incalculable.

We shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for consideration. I urge that early consideration be given to this proposed measure.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,  
Secretary.

## CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1976) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 25, 1957.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes.

The main purpose of the proposed legislation is to change statutory language relating to the application of rules for preventing collisions on the Great Lakes and their connecting waters in order to make it clear that such rules apply to foreign vessels navigated within the territorial waters of the United States.

The present language of the statute concerning the applicability of the Great Lakes rules states that such rules shall be followed in the navigation "of all public and private vessels of the United States" (33 U. S. C. 241), while the statutory provisions concerning the inland rules and the western rivers rules provide for their applicability to all vessels (33 U. S. C. 154, 301). Because of the difference in language, the applicability of the Great Lakes rules to foreign



vessels has been questioned, despite section 4401 of the revised statutes (46 U. S. C. 364) which provides in part that all " \* \* \* vessels navigating the Great Lakes shall be subject to the navigation rules of the United States when navigating within the jurisdiction thereof \* \* \*." Therefore, it is considered desirable to amend the statutory language concerning the Great Lakes rules to remove any doubt that foreign vessels navigating the Great Lakes are subject to the rules while within the territorial waters of the United States.

In addition to the above change, a change is proposed in the penalty provisions of the statute, as well as a repeal of two obsolete sections of the revised statutes. A memorandum enclosed herewith analyzes in more detail the proposed changes, together with the reasons therefor.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,  
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

#### AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO INCLUSION OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS IN CERTIFICATES OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1977) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,  
Washington, March 29, 1957.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to

the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

JAMES R. DUFFEE,  
Chairman.

#### ISSUANCE OF BONDS TO FINANCE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue bonds to finance the school-construction program of the District of Columbia, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1932) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue bonds to finance a school-construction program in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to expend, out of any proceeds received from the sale of bonds pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this act, such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for the planning and completion of a school-construction program in the District of Columbia, including the planning, renovation, repair, modernization, construction, and equipping of an adequate and modern school system; and

(2) for expanding the school facilities of the District of Columbia in such manner as they deem to be in the public interest, including but not limited to, the provision of adequate teacher-training facilities, post-high-school educational facilities, special facilities for the handicapped, and professional, technical, and vocational educational facilities.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes referred to in the first section of this act, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized from time to time to issue bonds, in a total amount not to exceed \$69,210,000, for sale to the public, in such amounts, at such times, and upon such conditions as to price, interest, amortization, time for calling and otherwise, as the Commissioners shall prescribe in the notice of issuance of such bonds. Any such notice shall provide for the receipt of sealed, secret bids. The Commissioners shall accept the lowest responsible bid therefor, except that they may reserve to themselves the right to reject any and all bids.

(b) Such bonds, and the interest thereon, shall constitute a charge against all revenues coming into the hands of the District of Columbia and against any funds deposited to the credit of the District of Columbia in any banking institution or with the Treasury of the United States. Such bonds shall be guaranteed, both as to principal and interest, by the United States.

(c) The interest paid on such bonds shall be free of all Federal and District of Columbia taxes of any kind.

(d) No bonds shall be issued pursuant to this act which provide for the payment of principal and interest thereon for more than 20 years after the date of issuance.

#### AMENDMENT OF SHIPOWNER'S LIMITED LIABILITY LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the law relating to limitations of liability on vessels in order to provide that the owner's interest in certain insurance be included in such liability.

Under the present law, upon the happening of a sea disaster, widows, dependent children, and injured persons are faced with a limitation of the shipowner's liability which assures them little, if anything, by way of compensation for loss.

In the United States it was established by the act of March 3, 1851—Forty-six United States Code, Annotated, pages 181-189—that each voyage of a vessel is an isolated venture, and the shipowner need not risk his personal fortune beyond the value of the ship and income earned from freight.

Obviously, this offers little help to those affected by a sea disaster when the vessel goes to the bottom of the ocean, and the freight never reaches its destination.

In 1935, after the *Morro Castle* disaster, the act of March 3, 1851, was amended so as to establish a fund for payment of personal injury or death claims, if and when established in a court of law. The fund is calculated at the rate of \$60 per ton of the vessel involved. It is clear that such a fund will be inadequate in the cases of most casualties or injuries.

Mr. President, shipowners can buy insurance on vessels and liability insurance connected with their operation just as you and I can buy insurance on our own automobiles. The bill I have just introduced is a step in the direction of assuring more adequate benefits in these cases, because, if enacted into law, it would bring into the fund for widows, dependent children, and injured persons affected by a sea disaster, the proceeds of insurance covering the shipowner's insurable interest in his vessel, and his liability insurance. In other words, instead of the shipowner pocketing the proceeds of his hull insurance and liability insurance, as he may do under the present law, my bill would provide that the proceeds of such insurance would go into the fund to afford the means of compensation to those who have suffered the direct consequences of loss of life or bodily injury in a sea disaster. Such liability, as well as damages for death or bodily injury, of course, would have to be established in the usual manner, including determinations in courts of law.

Mr. President, this legislative proposal impresses me as being most meritorious, and I urge that it be given serious and prompt attention by the Senate committee to which it is referred. In view of its desirable objectives, I am sure that many of my colleagues wish to associate themselves as cosponsors. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record, and be held at the desk until the close of business May

13 in order that other Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1983) to amend the law relating to the limitation of liability on vessels in order to provide that the owner's interest in certain insurance be included in such liability, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subsection (a) of section 4283 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 183 (a)) is amended by inserting after "exceed the amount or value of the interest" a comma and "including all hull insurance and liability insurance."

#### SALE OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO CERTAIN CITIZENS OF FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to certain citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk through Monday, May 6, to permit other Senators who may be interested to join as sponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to certain citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PAYNE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### DESIGNATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, NASHVILLE, TENN., AS THE J. PERCY PRIEST VETERANS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the next time it is printed, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Nashville, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Veterans' Memorial Hospital, introduced by me on April 16, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON BRAZOS RIVER, TEX. (S. DOC. NO. 34)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting an interim report dated January 11, 1957, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers, and illustrations, on a review of report on the Brazos River, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of August 12, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at Labor and Industry Day dinner, Foremen's Club, Philadelphia, Pa., May 1, 1957.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Statement by Representative EMANUEL Celler on May 2, 1957, before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary in favor of S. 1356.

#### NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF A NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Wilson C. Flake, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States to Ghana.

Notice is given that this nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold K. Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice W. Wilson White, resigned.

A. Pratt Kesler, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 8, 1957.

Bernard A. Boos, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under

an appointment which expires April 16, 1957.

Clement W. Crahan, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 21, 1957.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 9, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

#### POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark the 166th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. I have prepared a statement in this connection, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Tomorrow, May 3, is a significant date in Polish history. It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland enacted one of the first democratic, progressive constitutions in Europe. May 3 became Poland's national day.

This year May 3 is of special significance. This year, for the first time since Communism clamped its iron fist on Poland, the Poles are able to celebrate their own national day.

Heretofore, the people of Poland have been compelled by their Communist masters to confine their celebrating to July 10, the anniversary of Poland's subjugation by the Soviet Union. May 3 has still not been officially restored as Poland's national day. But the Warsaw government has been compelled, by the heroism of the Polish people, to allow them to commemorate the occasion privately.

This evidence of a liberalization on the part of the Communist regime in Poland is a direct result of the uprising in the streets of Poznan last June. Polish workers, rioting in the city, raising their hands against the Communist tyranny, demonstrated once and for all the fallacy of the theory that communism is the rule of peasants and workers.

They cried in the streets of Poznan for bread, for freedom, for withdrawal of the Red army. They showed the world how communism has brought Poland to a state of economic ruin. And as a result, in October, Poland underwent a bloodless revolution against its Soviet overlords.

The present Gomulka government is still Communist. It must tread carefully, for there are five Red army divisions in Poland, 23 in East Germany, 20 in Hungary, and 8 in Rumania and Czechoslovakia, to say nothing of the bulk of Soviet troops on the eastern border of Poland. But the striving of the Polish people for greater freedom, for absolute independence from the Soviet Government and a return to the west, and for recovery from the disastrous economics forced on them by Soviet exploitation, will not be denied.

Soviet policy has demonstrated that it will not tolerate too much liberalism in Poland nor the return of democracy to that country, if the Soviet Union can prevent it. But the heroic workers of Poznan have also demonstrated that even the world's largest army



cannot forever subjugate a people determined to breathe the air of freedom. Their courage has already borne fruit, as demonstrated by the fact that May 3 will be observed tomorrow, once more, in Poland, and by many other evidences of a Polish evolution in the direction of freedom.

I feel, Mr. President, that all Americans may well join tomorrow in an expression of friendship and sympathy for the people of Poland, of admiration for their courage, of confidence that the inevitable collapse of the Soviet satellite empire will find the people of Poland in the vanguard of the forces of freedom. And I feel also that it is incumbent upon us to do anything we can, consistent with the interests of the United States, to help our friends in Poland in speeding the day when, once again, they shall enjoy the democratic privileges symbolized in their history by the date of May the third.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, being mindful of the 3-minute rule, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 5 minutes by the clock on the subject of the anniversary of Poland's constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that tomorrow will be the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland in 1791, only 4 years after the adoption of our own. The Communists have not allowed the celebration of this national holiday. However, one of the concessions gained by the Polish people out of the events of last October permits private observance, but not national recognition. To take note of this date is particularly appropriate this year, as it has been an unusually eventful one for Poland and for the Soviet bloc in general. The Poznan uprising and the bloodless revolution in October have lasting significance, in that they have shattered the Soviet propaganda and theory. This fact is dramatically shown when Poland, formerly a granary of Europe, and in the face of Soviet promises for a better life for all, must beg enough food to feed her people.

Poland tried the Soviet way, and rebelled. Now there are indications that Poland would like to reject Soviet control and wishes to return to the family of Western nations. The withdrawal of Soviet troops was high among the demands of the people in October. Russia's desire for world domination holds no appeal for Poland. The people are now aware of Communist policy and what it can do to them. In the face of difficult circumstances and a vigorous rebellion, the Soviets reluctantly found it expedient, last October, to grant certain concessions. These concessions are not generally known. For instance, it is not generally known that 80 percent of the former collective farms have been returned to the peasants. A limited number of small shops have been permitted. Although the jamming stations in surrounding countries have increased their power, few people know that jamming within Poland has stopped, and the people are listening to the broadcasts of the Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Co., and Radio Free Europe. The Polish press itself has been remarkably bold in its criticism of Communist insti-

tutions. It would be difficult, indeed, for the Soviets to revoke these concessions as long as Poland averts economic collapse. Rather, it is likely that with a strengthened economy and an assurance of Western support Poland could continue to withdraw from Russian domination and again become a member of the Western family.

The Government of Poland has requested economic aid from the United States. Poland needs food, raw materials, and commodities to keep her industries going, and to prevent serious unemployment and hunger problems. Such conditions could, and very likely would, produce fertile soil for further Soviet intervention. It is notable that the request came to us rather than to the Kremlin.

Certainly there is risk involved. The Gomulka government is by no means free of Soviet influence. Here it is well to remember that Poland is surrounded on all sides by Soviet domination. Poland has already tried the patience of the Kremlin, and the presence of approximately 50 Russian military divisions in bordering satellites, as well as the U. S. S. R. itself on the east, demands restraint. Further, the Government faces a potentially disrupted economy drained of its resources by mismanagement and exploitation.

The time is here when aid to Poland could possibly break, and certainly weaken, the rule of the Kremlin in that country. In addition, if it is clear to other satellite nations that we welcome all nations who desire peace and freedom, it could change their course of action in the event conditions became ripe for modifications in their countries. It is an opportunity full of problems, but which, wisely faced, may advance the cause of freedom. We may not have such an opportunity again.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, commemoration of Polish Constitution Day tomorrow takes on added significance because of events of the past year which have demonstrated that the spirit of freedom still lives in that unhappy country and other nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The uprisings in Poznan, the Polish October events, and the heroic Hungarian revolution, weakened the grip of Communist Russia on those nations, and strengthened the forces working for peaceful liberation of the captive peoples.

Mr. President, I count many among the people of Polish descent in my State of Connecticut as close personal friends. They are a warmhearted, generous people, who keep alive the traditions of the land of their ancestors while yielding to none in their devotion to the American way of life. I know I speak for all the people of Connecticut in expressing the hope that the people of Poland will one day live in freedom.

Poland has requested economic aid from the United States. Representatives of the Polish Government have had conversations with our State Department, and we may expect recommendations to be made to the Congress in the near future. The decision as to whether to extend aid to Poland must rest upon facts not yet before us. While reserving

final judgment, Mr. President, until those facts are in our possession, I am sympathetically inclined to the view that it would be worth some risk to give Poland a reasonable amount of aid, in the hope that such evidence of America's desire to help the Polish people, not their rulers, would strengthen the forces working for freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of facts pertaining to the present situation in Poland be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FACTS PERTAINING TO THE PRESENT SITUATION IN POLAND

Developments in Poland are of the utmost importance to the West. With the process of de-Stalinization which followed the 20th Congress of Communist Party and when all western policies of liberation failed to materialize, Poles entirely unaided from the outside world showed the greatest possible determination to obtain maximum freedom and to restore their traditional links with the West. Last year's events in Poland and Hungary have shown the fallacy of the so-called Soviet bloc monolith.

The United States is interested in helping the Polish people who aim to attain freedom and democracy. It must be remembered that it was not Gomulka who made the Polish revolution but that under popular pressure so clearly revealed during the Poznan rising and the October events, the Communist Party in Poland was forced to make concessions and that the initiative came from the masses of the patriotic Poles.

The fact that the Communist government remains in power results from the country's geographical and political position. Poland is encircled by Soviet divisions—23 in East Germany, 20 in Hungary, approximately 8 in Rumania and Czechoslovakia, to say nothing of the bulk of Soviet troops on the eastern border of Poland. Under these conditions it is only too natural that Poland has to follow a very careful and restrained policy in order not to jeopardize the gains so far attained.

It must be noted that the Polish events and the Hungarian uprising showed that from the military point of view the Warsaw Pact has lost a great part of its importance. During the Poznan riots the Polish Army at that time under Rokossowski's command maintained a passive attitude. In the case of Hungary nearly the entire army went over to the side of the national revolutionaries. Therefore in case of conflict the Soviet Union could not trust the so-called satellite armies.

The Polish people are very much opposed to the presence of 5 Soviet divisions on Polish soil under the terms of the Warsaw Pact. The present Polish leadership is trying hard to explain that the presence of the Soviet troops in Poland is necessary owing to the lack of security with regard to the Polish western frontiers. One of the elements of Soviet pressure on Poland is the fact that Poland's western frontiers on the Oder-Neisse line are still unrecognized by western powers.

The recent compromise arrived at between Gomulka and the so-called Stalinist group of the party stems from the fact that Gomulka does not represent the absolute majority in the party. In order to obtain the upper hand in the party's leadership it is obvious that Gomulka is maneuvering toward some sort of compromise. There may also have been an ultimatum from the Soviet Union dictating such policy as one of the conditions under which Poland is allowed more independence than the other subjugated nations.

There are also certain moves which may be interpreted as strengthening the Communist rule. The Communist Party would certainly like to limit freedom of expression as far as the Polish press is concerned, as it considers that the press is going too far in its criticism of Communist institutions. Jamming of foreign broadcast has ceased and people are now listening to the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and the B. B. C. Soviet jamming stations in Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany have increased their interference however.

The Communist Party has also limited the hopes of the Council of Workers that it would have a larger voice in the management of factories and mines. All this goes to show that the situation in Poland is far from being or becoming stabilized. On the one hand is a stubborn patriotic and really heroic nation trying to rid itself of Communist rule, and on the other, is a divided Communist Party. One branch, the Stalinist camp, would like to return to the previous methods of governing by police and strict controls. The second camp is the group of Communist liberals which would like to introduce national communism. Between these two tendencies stands Gomulka maneuvering the situation with great difficulty from any extremities which in most cases would boil down to Soviet military intervention.

On the economic front Poland urgently needs about 500 million foreign credits and is trying to expand her foreign trade. Negotiations in Washington show that Poland needs most of all foodstuff, raw materials, and commodities with which to feed her industry. Hunger and unemployment could have disastrous consequences which in turn would bring Soviet intervention.

In the national, economic field there have been sweeping changes. Collectivization of agriculture has ceased; 80 percent of the collective farms have been dissolved and the peasants have taken back land, machines, and livestock. Craftsmen have been allowed to ply their trade again and small shops are now permissible. During the past 2 months 20,000 small shops were reopened. It would be very difficult for any Communist government in Poland to revoke these decisions and trends.

The new leadership of Poland has come to certain terms with the Catholic Church. On October 24, 1956, Cardinal Wyszyński was released after 3 years of imprisonment without court sentence. Cardinal Wyszyński in his sermons appeal to the Polish nation for patience and endurance.

The Polish nation as a whole manifested its complete sympathy with the Hungarian uprising. In every Polish town and village a committee for help to Hungary was created. Poland although herself in dire economic straits tried extensively to help the Hungarian people.

The Polish nation looks toward America for political, moral, and economic support. They realize that in this era of atomic warfare their final liberation will not come through war. They hope, however, that by maintaining constant pressure on the forces of slavery represented by the Soviet Union, the West will bring nearer the day of their liberation by peaceful means. One of these means is strengthening Poland by economic aid. American help has a tremendous psychological impact not only on Poland, but on other subjugated nations such as Czechoslovakia.

The 3d of May provides an opportunity to pay homage to the Polish people who, moved by their love of freedom, are wisely and cautiously trying to gain complete freedom and democracy and restore Poland's ties with the West. It cannot be repeated strongly enough that it was not Gomulka who brought about the changes in Poland and the bloodless revolution, but that the actual achievements were due to the popular pressure. At the time of the Poznan break, freedom, and Rus-

sians-go-home riots, Gomulka was still politically negligible.

The whole Polish situation calls for a constructive, imaginative policy for central and eastern Europe, which until now, has not been formulated.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark the anniversary of the enactment in 1791 of the first democratic and progressive constitution of Poland. It is symbolic of Poland's courage and unquenchable thirst for freedom that, for the first time since the Communist subjugation of Poland, private celebrations of this historic event will be allowed in Poland. Let us hope that the fight for freedom will continue to advance so that next year this anniversary may be publicly commemorated in Poland.

Events since last May 3 in Poland have been truly historic. The Polish people, through their daring struggle against their Communist masters, have won important concessions and a measure of freedom.

I know that in the years to come they will succeed in enlarging these concessions and freedom, so that the day will be hastened when an independent and democratic Poland will be restored to the community of nations.

It is my purpose, in rising today, to pay my respects to the valiant Polish patriots, and to join them in commemorating this important day in their national life.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, 166 years ago tomorrow, on May 3, 1791, the people of Poland enacted one of the first democratic constitutions in Europe. Thus tomorrow people of Polish descent all over the world will be commemorating Poland's National Day.

It is interesting to note that this date so nearly coincides with the ratification of our own Constitution. As we think of what has transpired in this past century and a half, we in this country must indeed be grateful for the many blessings which have befallen us, in direct contrast to the multitude of misfortunes which have overtaken the Polish people.

Today, we feel a strong common bond with the Polish people when we realize that they are still fighting for the same freedoms we have enjoyed and cherished since the founding of our country.

The Polish uprisings last June showed the world that these proud people will not bow to Soviet tyranny, and that they will not be content to exist as a mere satellite in the Soviet orbit.

Since October, Poland has been, in fact, an independent nation.

We have every reason to believe that the people of this great little nation will hold fast to what they have achieved and will continue to strive for a more democratic government until they once again stand as a part of the free world.

Let us on this Polish National Day, assure the brave people of Poland, that they are not forgotten.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Friday of this week, May 3, the people of Poland will observe Poland's National Day, the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791. This was one of the first European constitutions providing a democratic type of government.

In the years which have followed since 1791 the people of Poland have suffered on many occasions from conquering armies. The latest conqueror is Soviet Russia.

Events in Poland during the past year have been momentous and indicative of the great changes which have been sweeping through many of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. The Poznan uprising in June of last year was a very significant indication of the desperate and bitter hatred of communism held by workers and peasants in Poland. I feel sure that the same feeling exists in other subjugated countries.

The Poznan uprising was a great shock to the Russian rulers. It led directly to the great events in Poland of last October when, through what really amounted in many respects to a bloodless revolution, the Soviet Government was forced to make a number of important concessions to the Polish Government and to the Polish people. While Poland does not enjoy the liberty her people so greatly desire her situation has been greatly improved.

One of the concessions made to Poland has been the granting of permission for a celebration on May 3 honoring the anniversary of the constitution. The Russians for many years have prohibited this observance, and forced the Polish people to celebrate on July 10 of each year the subjugation of Poland by the Soviet Union.

I am proud to speak of this observance in the Senate today, and to express the hope that the democratic principles set forth in the original Polish Constitution in 1791, and maintained through the years by the courage and determination of the Polish people, will once more become the basic laws of Poland.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the 166th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. On this day in 1791, the Polish nation, in the midst of autocratic Europe, adopted a constitution eloquent with the love of liberty. The bitter struggle of this brave people to preserve the principles of that occasion has continued through the years.

This year, 1957, Poland can proudly observe its progress in this unending struggle against tyranny. The irresistible spirit of the Polish people flashed forth in the Poznan riots last June. Finally, in October, they shed reactionary Russian controls and raised up the Gomulka government. It is a leadership of Communists, to be sure, but of nationalists also who, as Poles, have reestablished the Church at the very heart of the nation to express the real yearnings of the people.

Today, Poland's existence is precarious. In the shadow of its totalitarian neighbor, it is beginning to assert the right to determine its own destiny. We are watching this magnificent effort with warm sympathy and hope, and we join with Polish people everywhere in saluting the gains which have been obtained during this historic year.

It is our fervent hope and prayer that the weakened chains may soon be burst as under the impact of the striving for liberty, and that we shall once again



proudly welcome this courageous nation into the ranks of the free.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, May 3, 1791, is a date remembered by Polish people everywhere because of the adoption of one of the first European democratic and progressive constitutions.

Many changes have been wrought in that country, but the anniversary of the enactment of that constitution still is close to the hearts of Polish people throughout the world.

As May 3 will mark the anniversary of Poland's national day, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, entitled "A Tribute to the People of Poland," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

This year, for the first time in many years, the Polish people will be able to celebrate their national independence day, May 3. True, no public displays will be tolerated by the Government. But at least within the privacy of their homes historic events, memorable for what they have meant in terms of human freedoms, will be recalled with pride and hope.

Indeed, the happenings of the past year give some cause for hope, a hope which has its roots in the magnificent bravery, at the same time cool and reckless, of the Polish people.

Consider the circumstances in which they find themselves. They are surrounded by Soviet troops on all sides. Some twenty-odd divisions of these troops lie to their west in East Germany. A like number is in Hungary. Other divisions are in Czechoslovakia and Rumania. The armed might of the Soviet Union is entrenched within Poland itself. In addition, the subversive tentacles of Soviet-directed communism are twisted in a stranglehold around many areas of their national life.

Yet in spite of the dangers without and within the Polish people have dared to raise their voices against their Communist masters in Poland and the Soviet Union.

The result has been, not complete freedom, but what could perhaps be described as a kind of creeping freedom.

Freedom of the press is not permitted. But at least some measure of freedom of person and of speech is allowed.

Freedom of religion is not untrammelled. But at least, within the bounds of communism and dictatorship, religion is allowed to perform some part of its humble ministry.

A government of, by, and for the people is far from a reality in Poland. But at least some of the iron strictures of Stalinism have been removed and a limited choice among Communists is tolerated.

What has been accomplished in the past year in Poland in terms of the fight for human liberty has been the work of the Polish people. No assistance came, or perhaps could have come, from the outside. The Polish people have done it themselves.

For this they deserve the admiration and tribute of the free world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement he has prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

On May 3, 1791, one of the first democratic constitutions of Europe was enacted by the

freedom-loving men and women of Poland. Now it is 1957 and we are on the eve of the anniversary of that momentous occasion. Our emotions, however, are not completely joyful. We think with satisfaction of the democratic spirit of Poland, but we are horrified by the attempts which have been made to bind it with the chains of slavery. We remember the many Polish heroes who have devoted their lives to the cause of liberty, and the memory of their deeds accents the revulsion we feel when we consider the treatment suffered by their heirs at Poznan.

Yes, there is happiness in our hearts when we commemorate the great, democratic undertaking which was started in May 1791, but there is sorrow when we consider the trials which it has been forced to endure. Of the two sentiments, our joy is much the greater, however, for despite the blandishments and brutalities of would-be conquerors, Poland has preserved the spark of freedom.

When the tyrant's heel was pressed into the free soil of Poland, it failed to snuff out the love of freedom which is a vital part of the nature of that great nation. Oppressive force was unsuccessful in keeping the true patriots of Poland from publicizing their cause to the entire world.

With these thoughts in mind, we should join in commemorating the day on which the children and friends of free Poland in all parts of the world will be praying for complete deliverance of this troubled land.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as you know, tomorrow is the 166th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—one of the early democratic constitutions of Europe.

As we respectfully pay tribute to this important event in Polish history, it is, indeed, fitting that we reevaluate the changing situation in Poland today.

As we know, the courageous Polish people still strive for freedom. Although a tough Communist regime still controls the political and military machinery, it has not quelled the strong, nationalistic and freedom-loving spirit which is traditional in the people of that country. Yes, although atheists are still in the saddle, Poland's enduring devotion to God has been strengthened, not weakened.

By the uprisings at Poznan in June 1956, and the pursuant events, the Poles have strongly expressed their revulsion against Communist rule. The bloodless revolution of October, though obviously far from completely successful, gained a welcome degree of liberalization in which the people could breathe more freely.

Basically, the political climate has been improved somewhat, with the people gaining a few more liberties, some more freedom of expression, and opportunities for individual enterprise.

We are hopeful, of course, that this lays the groundwork for still wider advances toward freedom. We hope, as well, that it sets an example of an overall trend toward independence, which may well be followed by other countries under Kremlin domination.

#### SOVIET FAILURE OF THREE FRONTS

Thus, by their stouthearted actions, the Poles have once again made important contributions to the free world's cause.

In addition, they have contributed to Soviet failure on three fronts:

On the political front, the Poles—together with the Hungarians—have broken down the illusion of a monolithic bloc of Communist states.

On the economic front, they have tried, found wanting—and negated the Communist economic theory. For example, collective farms—having miserably failed at meeting production standards—are being dissolved and the peasants are taking back land, machines, and livestock. Too, craftsmen are being allowed to ply their trades again and small shops are reportedly permissible.

On the strategic front, the passive attitude of the Polish military toward the Poznan rioters indicated that Russian Communists cannot rely on Polish—and no doubt other dominated nations'—troops, as a Soviet-aligned fighting force.

#### AID TO POLAND IS IN INTEREST OF PEACE

Now, we must ask ourselves: How can we effectively and wisely take advantage of the turn of events—to further help the Polish people and the cause of the free world?

In every reasonable way possible, of course, we must encourage their effort toward greater independence and freedom.

Naturally, caution is advisable—since we do not want to expose Poland to a tragic slaughter, such as occurred in Hungary.

Consequently—as stated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles—we must not attempt to encourage open revolt.

Instead, subtle pressures inside the Polish boundaries—and outside where possible—must be applied to widen the cleavage between Poland and the Kremlin, and to encourage the will to freedom, so traditionally inherent in the Polish people.

As we recognize, we must deal through Gomulka—a hard-core Communist, and leader of the Communist Party membership of 1,500,000.

Regrettably, this minority still maintains tight rein over Poland's 28 million people.

#### WE MUST TREAD CAREFULLY

Thus, in attempting to aid Poland, we must tread carefully.

As we recognize, the Poles are striving to maintain a balance between three points:

First, The Polish nation hungers for greater freedom and liberalization, and for absolute independence from the Soviet Government;

Second, The country's economy, in disastrous shape after so many years of Soviet exploitation and Communist mismanagement, desperately needs help to restore stability; and

Third, Soviet policy has demonstrated on many occasions that it will not tolerate too much liberalism.

In the face of these conditions, progress may be somewhat slower than we might wish.

However, we must be wise, enterprising—and, as necessary, bold—in taking full advantage of this Achilles heel in the Soviet-designed buffer zone around the Kremlin.

We know, of course, there is a great deal of controversy over the use of economic aid to Poland.

Naturally, we want to be careful to assure that our efforts in no way strengthen the Communist war machine.

#### SENATE'S WISE ACTION TO FEED THE HUNGRY

However, if economic aid can be utilized for strategic advantage—in strengthening Poland's efforts toward greater independence, and weakening the Soviet influence in Poland—then, that policy appears to be sufficiently justified.

That is why I am so pleased that the majority of the Senate wisely acted to authorize the constructive use of surplus United States foodstuffs for Polish aid.

Meanwhile, we must continue to assure the Poles, privately through Radio Free Europe, governmentally through the Voice of America, and every other possible public and private channel, of our desire—and intention—to continue to assist their struggle for independence.

#### CONCLUSION

As we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, we pay sincerest respect to a historic advance in democratic government.

As we know, there are over 7 million Americans of Polish descent in this country.

To them, and to those in their homeland who aspire to a return to Poland to its proud democratic tradition—we pledge our relentless efforts to encourage independence, and promote peace and security in a free world.

#### INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce at this time that a subcommittee has been set up within the Foreign Relations Committee to deal with a number of agreements pending before the Senate relating to the control and conservation of international fisheries. These agreements consist of an interim convention for the conservation of the North Pacific fur seals; a protocol to the international convention for the regulation of whaling; and to a protocol with Canada with respect to the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser River system.

The subcommittee, which will be under the chairmanship of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has not yet fixed a date for hearings on these agreements; but it is contemplated that such hearings will be held in the near future. Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

#### THE KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I know the sun will shine in Old Kentucky for the running of the Kentucky Derby this coming Saturday. Ten thousand voices will be raised, and scores of thousands will cheer the champion of champions in the sport of kings.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has a connection in the race. His brother happens to own a horse which was foaled in

Old Kentucky, called Round Table. I am not giving out any tips, but since one of our colleagues is so closely connected with a horse foaled in Old Kentucky, and now owned in Oklahoma, I wanted to bring that to the attention of my colleagues.

#### THE AMERICAN WEST

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 29 the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] placed in the RECORD an article that is to appear in the June issue of Harper's Magazine, entitled "The American West: Perpetual Mirage." The article was written by the noted historian, Walter Prescott Webb.

I do not care to dwell more than a moment or two on this subject, but I do feel those of us who live in the Far West, and particularly those of us who have lived all our lives on what this man calls the American desert, should rise in defense against some of the remarks used by Dr. Webb in his article. Those who live in the desert like it. I am not in agreement with the assertion of Dr. Webb when he says that the area does not produce men or products. The fact is that we in the West are young. We have not had the time that men in the East have had. But we are proud of what we have done.

When Dr. Webb states that men are not produced in the West, I call attention to the fact that one college in Texas furnished more officers in World War II than did the Military or Naval Academies. Arizona gave Teddy Roosevelt the Rough Riders. The California 40th Infantry of the National Guard was the one that did the groundwork in Korea.

He states that the white men drove the Indians west. The Indians were there far before the white men were, in the East they are still there, and we are proud of them.

Let me only talk of my own State in answer to the doctor's charges.

With respect to population, Arizona leads the Nation in the percentage gain, having had a gain of 65 percent from 1945 to 1955. Out of the first 10 States, showing the greatest population growth, the first three are so-called desert States.

Arizona is second in the rate of income growth, showing a gain, over that same period, of 142.8 percent in the rate of income growth. Again, 4 of the top 10 States are the so-called desert States.

Arizona leads the Nation in the rate of farm income growth, with an increase of 143 percent. Here again we find Arizona, Texas, and New Mexico in the top 10 States.

Arizona is first in growth of manufacturing employment, with an increase of 192 percent. Here again we find that 5 of the top 10 States are in the desert area Dr. Webb speaks so little of.

Arizona leads the Nation in nonferrous minerals production, with an increase of 266.4 percent. Again, Arizona, Montana, Utah, and Idaho are listed among the first 10.

Arizona leads the Nation in bank capital growth, with an increase of 291.7 percent. Again, 4 of the top 10 States are in this desert area of which the doctor speaks so belittlingly.

Arizona leads the Nation in the rate of bank deposit growth, with an increase of 104.7 percent. Again we find that the first 3 of the top 10 States are in the desert area.

Arizona has the second best gain in life insurance in force, with a gain of 342 percent. Again, 5 out of the top 10 States are in the desert area.

Mr. President, I should like to have the Senators from these other so-called desert States stand up and analyze for Dr. Webb and Harper's magazine what we in the West have been able to do by having the courage to fight the problems presented by the heat and barrenness of the desert. We are proud of our region in the West. We are proud to live in the desert. We are proud we have been able to make the desert produce.

In spite of what Dr. Webb thinks, we shall continue to live there.

To close, Dr. Webb states as a fact that our area is devoid of forests. Two-thirds of my State of Arizona is covered by the largest ponderosa pine forest in the world.

I do not know where the distinguished doctor obtained his information, but I will try to help set him right. It seems to me a student of his stature should have looked into the matter a little more.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As a Senator from an eastern State, I should like to make the observation that the Senators from the West do pretty well in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to say that I appreciate very much the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I have read the article by Dr. Webb, in which he states that this area of our country out in the West does not produce any great men. I should like to ask him this: What State furnished the military leader for the Spanish-American War? He was Gen. Frederick Funston, of Kansas. What State furnished the leader for World War I? He was Gen. John J. Pershing, of Missouri. What State furnished the leader for World War II? He was Dwight D. Eisenhower, now the President of the United States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have not yet had the doubtful pleasure of reading the article written by the man to whom the Senator refers as a student. I would hesitate to classify him as a true student if the conclusions he has drawn are in line with the thoughts the Senator has just expressed, and the thoughts expressed by other Senators I have heard mention him.

First of all, I do not concede that my own State is a desert State.



Mr. GOLDWATER. The doctor does consider your State a desert State.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that he does, which shows that he ought to travel across the United States at least sometime during his life.

I hope that in the near future I may also, on the floor of the Senate, further enlighten him as to some of the great accomplishments of the State of Colorado, and also of the other States in the West, which have contributed so much to the safety and security of this country throughout its entire growth.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to add to the list of "Who's Who," furnished by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. Which State produced the present Vice President of the United States? The State of California.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have not yet had an opportunity to read Dr. Webb's article, but I understand he made some derogatory remarks about the State of North Dakota.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The author does not think highly of all 17 States of the West.

Mr. YOUNG. May I say that North Dakota is proud of the great record it has established. It is a land of unlimited opportunity, rich soil, vast national resources and a spirited people.

North Dakota leads the Nation in barley and flax production. We are No. 2 in wheat production and we rank high in the production of other agriculture products.

North Dakota has an enviable record in its service to the Nation. Not only did the State rank No. 1 in war bond purchases during World War II, but its crack 164th Infantry Regiment was one of the first units of the American Army to take the offensive against the Japanese in the Pacific. Its courageous troops fought gallantly, with heavy losses, on Guadalcanal.

We furnished some of the finest and most gallant soldiers in the entire United States during both world wars, the Spanish-American War and the Korean action.

North Dakota's history is an inspiring one, and it is today one of the great States of the Union.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The doctor went on to complain that we had never had wars fought in the West. We are very happy about that, but I do believe the Texans will admit they had a pretty good battle at San Antonio, and there was a Civil War battle in the State of Arizona.

We are peaceful people. We do not like to go around shooting each other. Therefore, we have not provided spectacular wars for this doctor to record.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I gather that the article in Harper's magazine, to which the distinguished Senator is referring, was in one of the early editions of Harper's, when they first began to publish the magazine. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It could have been translated from pictographs from one of the walls of our canyons in Arizona, but I suspect that is not so, because it is dated June of this year.

Mr. CURTIS. It was published in this day of enlightenment, when Dr. Webb could have obtained accurate information if he had wished to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In fact, this article was inserted in the RECORD before it was even published and made available to the public.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I might say to the Senator that New York State has 10 percent of the population of the United States and furnishes 20 percent of the taxes. I believe I speak for my colleague [Mr. Ives] when I say we welcome very much the 17 Western States, and think they are great.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With all the land grant colleges in New York—and we are glad to give you our land—we welcome that note of welcome.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to be able to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arizona for the talk he has presented today. As a former resident of Colorado, although today I represent the State of New Jersey, I have the honor of being an honorary third Senator from Colorado, part of the western area which is being discussed. I know Colorado very well, and know the distinguished Senators from the State of Arizona. Anything the distinguished Senator says about Arizona is welcome to my ears. It is real music to my ears, because what the West has done for this country cannot be overstated.

If anybody delivers a calumny against the West, I wish to be in line with those who say that misstatement must be corrected. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In closing, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, and tell the Senator he is also one of our ex officio Senators from Arizona, because we welcome him out there every fall for his annual rest.

Mr. CAPEHART. And Indiana, also.

#### CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN CONNECTION WITH CONSTRUCTION OF GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on April 29 I introduced on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. LANGER] Senate bill

1932, which deals with a proposed irrigation project in my State. The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Works, because it was designed to amend a flood-control act. The bill properly belongs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have discussed this with the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and he has no objection to the bill being transferred to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1932) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Committee on Public Works will be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ADDRESS TO NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday President Eisenhower greeted some 150 members of the National Council of the League of Women Voters in the Rose Garden of the White House. In speaking to these prominent women President Eisenhower made a clear and concise statement of the importance of our economic assistance and mutual-security programs to this country's national security.

Because of the widespread sentiment which is currently calling for budget reductions, and I am in sympathy with that, I believe that it is of utmost importance to call attention to the vital importance of our so-called foreign-aid programs in our foreign policy and our own defense. There are certain worldwide conditions which we cannot ignore or wish away, no matter how great our desire for cutting back expenditures. We must approach budget reductions fully aware of our responsibilities for the peace and orderly development of the world.

As the President has accurately and forcefully placed this matter in clear perspective, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his comments yesterday to the National Council of the League of Women Voters be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S REMARKS TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, MAY 1, 1957, IN THE WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN

Ladies of the National Council, when you ask for comments on foreign policy and the operation of foreign policy, you in effect ask for a sort of marathon performance that can

go on here for much longer than the time you have to spare, I am sure.

First of all, I would earnestly want to commend you for your interest in this problem. The foreign problem overshadows everything else that we have as an argument at home or what we would call one of our domestic problems. It either causes that problem or certainly colors it. Our defensive arrangements, in all of their different aspects, account for about 63 percent of our budget. So all of the economies that we would like to accomplish in our tax take and in our expenditures finally come back—if we are going to make them in very large amount—to affect this foreign policy problem that we have.

Now there are a few things that I think we should understand. A foreign policy is not difficult to state. We are for peace, first, last and always, for very simple reasons. We know that it is only in a peaceful atmosphere, a peace with justice, one in which we can be confident, that America can prosper as we have known prosperity in the past. It is the only way that our people can, in the long run, be freed of great burdens and devote their substance to the constructive purposes that we have—in schools and hospitals and helping the development of our people in every way.

#### FROM A POSITION OF STRENGTH

We seek that peace from a position of strength. As long as there is abroad in the world a predatory force, seeking to destroy our form of government, we are going to remain strong. It is only prudence, and as a matter of fact, it is the only way to be successful. Because when you are talking to people that respect only force, you must have the ability to use force. But we recognize those constructive arrangements as negative and sterile themselves. And again, we want to get rid of that burden.

Now, as we pursue peace, we have organized—there was organized some years ago—the United Nations. The United Nations is not always effective, of course, in any particular instance, because of circumstances. But it does represent, as we see it, the greatest hope that the world has for establishing finally a forum in which differing viewpoints will be brought and argued and where arrangements may be made that will be necessary, if we finally come to the point that all of us realize we must live peacefully.

It can help, therefore, in bringing about peace and much more so in maintaining peace with justice, after we have had some kind of workable arrangement that will allow us to reduce armaments.

When a specific problem comes up, for example, the Suez argument of last fall, no one would claim that the United Nations is necessarily the most effective instrument for deciding the particular dispute. But if any nation such as ours, powerful as it is, ignores the United Nations in trying to solve these disputes, what is going to happen to this greatest hope of all mankind for peace?

You must respect it. You must work through it so far as it is possible. But the charter itself of the United Nations does not preclude the attempt to establish, prevent or restore peace through individual methods.

#### U. N. CHARTER CITED

As a matter of fact, the Charter says in case of dispute the first efforts should be made between the contending countries themselves. You can do it also by regional and other organized efforts that do not involve the United Nations—but if the United Nations is ignored, I think we do it at our future peril.

Another point that I think is important for all of us to remember: The strongest force abroad in the world today, particularly among those people that we call the more underdeveloped peoples, is the spirit of nationalism. This spirit is stronger than communism in these areas, and fortunately

it is stronger than the spirit of any communism in all of them—in some of them, I mean. What I mean by that is this: This desire to be free, to say I am a citizen of this country or that country, to say we are independent—this is a spirit that has been growing with tremendous leaps and bounds ever since the famous pronouncement of President Wilson of the right of self-determination of small peoples. Today it is a terrific force in the world.

Now this means this: They are going to remain independent, or they believe they are going to remain independent, by whatever means they have to use.

#### ECONOMIC BASE NEEDED

One of the things necessary to remain independent politically is to have an economic base on which that independence can be supported. Their determination to remain independent is so strong that they will get that economic help, that economic investment money, from somebody. And if we don't supply it or do our share of the supplying it from the free world basis, the free world standpoint, others will.

We know that they will not long remain independent if they go somewhere else. But they don't.

It is astonishing how frequently we are compared, in the minds of a citizen of one of these countries that we call underdeveloped, to Russia in terms of, well which is the strongest—which is correct—which is trying to take us over—which is trying to be truculent—which is trying to start the war.

We know we are peaceful. We know we are a country that is ruled by ourselves. Government only with the consent of the governed does not start wars, because it is the people that have to fight them that make the decision.

This is not true in dictatorships but the people of other countries don't understand this. I have been asked by people very high up in some of these governments, why do I not do so and so—why do I not suppress a certain magazine—why do I not do this, that or the other thing? My explanations—although I think very convincing—are often, to them, seemingly nothing.

A man said to me, "If you were our friend, you would do so and so." They don't understand. Therefore, they do not understand that our form of government is essentially one that is stable in preserving peace, and that it is dictatorships that can undertake the reckless adventure of war.

All of these problems are the kind of things that have to be considered when we are talking about the conflicting considerations of the safety of our country and our desire to keep more of our own money at home so we can spend it for what we please and not give it to the Government to spend. And with this last desire I must say I am earnestly in sympathy and I would very much like to go out of this office someday with another even bigger tax cut than we were able to put over in 1954.

The other day, I was riding in an airplane and I had some friends with me. And they began to criticize our efforts in the foreign field and say they thought we could save a lot of money there. Let us remember, foreign aid doesn't have any pressure group in any Congressman's district. It is something that has to depend on the intelligence of the American people and not on selfish interest.

And they said, "You say you are trying to be economical and you are trying to save money, yet you will spend this money over here, when you won't even give a Texas drought-stricken man so much corn meal and this and that and the other thing."

"Well," I said, "this is what I am going to try to explain in simple terms. We are riding in this airplane and let's assume we own it. We have been looking at the operational costs and we decide we are spending too

much money on it. Now we are going to save some money.

"Well, if we find we have 2 stewards on this plane. We figure that 1 can do. All right, one steward fired.

"Well, we agree we won't fly it over such long trips, we don't need so much fuel capacity, and we can save money and carry a better payload by getting rid of a tank. We won't fly in bad weather so we will get rid of an expert navigator and make the copilot double up. And we will cut down on the furniture. We will get rid of the carpets, and so on here.

"These are all the services that we have demanded up to date. But now that we find out how much it costs, we are ready to do without these services, but we are still dissatisfied with what we have saved."

So one bright fellow speaks up and says: "Well, let's just cut out one of the engines, we won't use so much gas."

Now you are talking about foreign aid. Foreign aid is one of the engines that keeps this ship of ours afloat in the world and going on a steady course. So the rest of the passengers say:

"Well, baloney—you take away that engine, then we lose one when we are out over the sea, and we have probably lost our reserves and we are down. We are now in an emergency without the preparation to meet it."

#### PREVENTING ISOLATION

Foreign aid, my friends, is something that is being conducted to keep the United States secure and strong. It is preventing the isolation of the United States as a prosperous, rich, powerful country. There would be isolation if the United States refused to participate in the realization by underdeveloped countries of their proper ambitions for nationalization, for national independence and for the economic base that will support that individual independence. That's all there is to it.

In my opinion, you can't take freedom and allow freedom finally to be pushed back to the shores of the United States and maintain it in the United States. It can't be done. There's too much interdependence in the world.

Now, I do not for one instant—this is getting to be a long speech, too, isn't it?—I do not for one instant maintain that every dollar put into this is wisely spent. I know there have been articles published showing where in Iran or somewhere else there were stores of supplies bought for a people and they found out later that they bought supplies for people that didn't even yet know how to use a hoe, or something like that.

Of course, there have been mistakes. There have been human people doing this. And sometimes they were trying to do it in a great hurry, or they were obsessed with the idea that money could buy friends and money could keep friends. Well, that is all untrue.

We can, though, with our attitude and with some investment, help these people. It is dangerous to make too close an analogy between our own experience and that of some of these countries.

You must remember, when we were developing and money was being invested in our country from abroad, on a loan basis properly, we had great natural resources. Those loans practically constituted a mortgage on all those great resources. We were very low in population. We have been growing up to our resources in population ever since. We have done it under conditions that have produced the greatest prosperity any nation has known.

These other countries are already far over and beyond their capacity, in some instances, of population—without a cent. How do you collect capital in those countries to do the job that needs to be done, to produce roads, railroads, communications—the things that allow people to pull themselves up by their



bootstraps? That is what we are trying to get people to do because we believe in peace.

We believe in peace. And we believe that the more these people rule themselves, the more that the decision for world action lies in the hands of the people who have to fight wars, then there will be fewer wars. That's what we believe.

#### THESE SIMPLE TRUTHS

Now I come back to my first thought, and that is how delighted I am to see you people interested in these things. Unless the United States understands these simple truths which I have just so roughly touched upon this morning—unless our people understand them and are ready to push them through—then the future doesn't look nearly so bright as it should.

If the United States does understand them, then the sacrifice of money is not going to sound in their ears like the sacrifice of our sons on the battlefield. That is what we are trying to prevent.

So let's make all the savings we can in the carpet and the chairs and the extra personnel and all the rest of the things that we have been demanding, wherever we think it is safe and just and fair among ourselves to do it. But let's not throw away the engines of this ship of state.

Thank you very much.

#### CHILD HEALTH DAY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday, May 1, was Child Health Day. It is fitting that we should set aside one day each year to call attention to the health needs of our children, and to pay tribute to the many public and private agencies which perform such signal services for the protection of our children's health and thereby the future vitality of our Nation.

In addition, President Eisenhower's proclamation of Child Health Day called attention to Universal Children's Day, which commemorates the work done by United Nations agencies to assist children everywhere. The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund has now been performing a marvelous service to the world for 10 years in their work for the improvement of the health of millions of children everywhere. By bringing medical assistance to many of the areas of the world where disease remains rampant and unchecked, UNICEF has brought protection through preventive medicine, as well as treatment, for millions of children faced with widespread incidence of yaws, tuberculosis, malaria, and other crippling diseases.

The love of children in their innocence is one which transcends geographical, political, religious, or racial differences and represents a common bond for mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the May 1 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "Health for All Children," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HEALTH FOR ALL CHILDREN

In today's world the health of one nation or one person becomes ever more the health of all. Therefore it is fitting that this country's traditional observance today of Child Health Day should be expanded to include Universal Children's Day, which commemo-

rates what is being done by United Nations agencies to improve the lot of children everywhere. A "salute" to this work is called for by President Eisenhower in his Child Health Day proclamation.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the world agency most directly concerned with the health of children, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. Established just after the war to feed the emaciated and hungry children of war-devastated Europe, UNICEF has gone on to help as many as possible of children everywhere who are victims of hunger and neglect and stalked by such disease enemies as tuberculosis, yaws, malaria, trachoma, and anemia. It is providing milk, cod liver oil, medicines, and other supplies to about 45 million needy children. Last year 80 governments contributed to the agency and 95 countries received aid, matching the value of their assistance at more than \$2 for each UNICEF dollar.

The health and future of American children are closely related to these activities. Seventy-five percent of the victims of malaria are children and UNICEF has been waging an offensive on this front; one of its biggest projects this year is to assist the malaria eradication campaign of our next-door neighbor, Mexico.

More healthy, productive citizens for the world of tomorrow will make that world a safer one for the American children who must function in it.

#### NATIONAL CEMETERY AT BIRCH COULEE, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there was published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 28 an article entitled "Heroes of Birch Coulee Save State," referring to a book entitled "Birch Coulee," written by Dr. Bernard F. Ederer, a former State legislator from Stevens County, Minn.

This is in connection with a bill, S. 1417, to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee, which I introduced in the Senate. Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN has introduced a companion bill in the House. It is House bill 3008. The article to which I refer states reasons supporting the desirability of enactment of this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 28, 1957]

#### HEROES OF BIRCH COULEE SAVE STATE

MORTON, MINN., September 3, 1862.—Sioux Indians under the command of Chief Gray Bird took flight today after a desperate 31-hour battle at nearby Birch Coulee in which 19 Minnesota infantrymen were killed and 44 wounded.

Only luck and the apparent unwillingness of the Indians to engage in open warfare kept the encounter from being more disastrous than it was, and Birch Coulee will go down in Minnesota history as the most spectacular battle of the Indian wars of 1862.

The battle began just before dawn yesterday, when more than 200 Indians swooped down with bloodcurdling yells on an encampment of the raw Sixth Minnesota Infantry and Renville Rangers Cavalry at the Coulee, 1½ miles north of Morton in Renville County.

Nearly all the troops' 100 horses were killed in the first half hour, and the men used the carcasses for cover until they could get their wagons turned over.

Main part of the battle lasted about an hour, but the Indians kept up desultory fire throughout the day and into the night. A few infantrymen were hit by these bullets as they left cover to aid the wounded, many of whom lay for 30 hours in burning sun and chill night without food or water before aid arrived.

Reinforcements from Fort Ridgely, many of them draftees on their way to fight in the Civil War, were heard firing cannon as they approached Birch Coulee about 2 p. m. yesterday, but they did not arrive until 11 a. m. today.

The fort is 14 miles away, an easy 5-hour march, yet it took 28 hours from the time the first Indian firing was heard to make the trip. This will go down in Minnesota history as a prime example of military stupidity.

Failure to pursue the fleeing Indians also is open to censure as an example of poor judgment.

But no one will dispute the courage and endurance of the Minnesota troops, and the halting of the Indians, even if it was due to their own fear at hearing reinforcing cannon approaching, may have been the factor which saved Minnesota for the white man.

For up until this point the Indians were winning the battle.

They massacred 644 citizens and killed 93 soldiers in battles.

The Dakota Sioux were sweeping east, Winnebagoes coming north from their reservation south of Mankato, and Chippewas coming south from the upper Mississippi area in a sort of pincer movement which devastated and virtually depopulated a region 200 miles long and 50 miles wide.

In 23 counties of western and southern Minnesota nearly all homes were abandoned as citizens fled eastward.

If the Indians then had succeeded in the Birch Coulee massacre as they had in the others, they could have swept on down the Minnesota River to St. Paul and driven all the white men out of the State.

In case you're confused, this story so far is a reconstruction from various histories of the battle of Birch Coulee.

Most Minnesotans have never heard of it, nor are they aware there is a State memorial park in Renville County commemorating it—and has been since 1893.

It comes as a surprise to Minnesotans that the battle is compared by some historians to the Alamo in Texas or the Little Big Horn in Montana.

However, with Minnesota's centennial year approaching, the people out in Birch Coulee territory hope to make a little more noise about it, and they're starting Monday.

A native son who grew up on a farm located practically on the battlefield and who now has written a novel based on the histories and legends of the battle, will speak at 8 p. m. Monday in Morton high school auditorium.

He is Dr. Bernard F. Ederer, now a Del Mar, Calif., dentist. He is a former State legislator from Stevens County and a former member of the State conservation commission.

Before he's through, he'll speak at Redwood Falls, Morris, Mankato, Bird Island, Olivia and other communities, telling the story of Birch Coulee. He addressed the State legislature 6 weeks ago about it and plans to go to the east coast from Minnesota publicizing the historical battle and his book.

Ederer will be inducted into the Sioux tribe at Monday's meeting. The head of the tribe, James Leith, supposed to be a descendant of the Birch Coulee villain, Chief Little Crow, will represent the Indians.

Future plans for Birch Coulee include clearing of a tree-covered natural amphitheater in the park, in which pageants formerly were presented, and moving of monuments and markers from adjacent properties to the actual battlefield site.

[From the Minneapolis Star of April 27 1957]

# THE HISTORY OF BIRCH COULIE

To the Editor:

Dr. Bernard F. Ederer, author of *Birch Coulie*, will appear at 8 p. m. Monday at the high school auditorium at Morton, Minn., to discuss the history of Birch Coulie.

This is an opportunity to draw statewide attention to a vital portion of Minnesota history which has been obscured through the years because it occurred at the same time as the Civil War. Indeed, had it not been for the implied permission of the late President Lincoln, the men who defended Birch Coulie instead would have had to join the Army to defend the North.

Birch Coulie battlefield lies in a part of a State park located a mile north of the Minnesota River and approximately 100 miles west of the Twin Cities with the nearest post office located at Morton. About three-fourths of a mile to the south, partially obscured by trees, stand the beautiful monuments of granite, erected by the will of the Minnesota Legislature of 1893. These monuments are dedicated to the brave heroes of Birch Coulie and the friendly Sioux, some of whose names appear on one shaft. For years the Birch Coulie monuments have remained almost unnoticed and unknown by the vast majority of Minnesotans. Had it not been for these brave ancestors, Minnesota as it is known today might never have been.

MRS. ARTHUR P. KEAVENY.

MORTON, MINN.

## AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit today an amendment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appropriate \$500 million for the National Cancer Institute, with the stipulation that this sum remain available until totally expended. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is a cosponsor with me of this proposal.

In other words, the National Cancer Institute need not allocate the entire amount during a single fiscal year, unless such a policy is completely feasible and practical.

My purpose is to put at the disposal of the men and women in this Institute, who are engaged in probably the most vital medical research of our time, all possible financial resources for the hastening of their urgent task.

I was shocked a few months ago when I noticed that the recordbreaking budget of the national administration, despite its \$72 billion size, actually would reduce by 3 percent the Federal funds appropriated for cancer research during the current fiscal year. Could any economy be more senseless and absurd than this—economy at the expense of our investigation into the causes of the most sinister disease plaguing mankind?

Last year I was informed by my friend, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, former Surgeon General of the United States, that the National Cancer Institute might use as much as \$500 million if the availability of the sum were known well in advance, and if extensive preparations might be made for the employment of skilled sci-

entists and medical researchers far ahead of time.

Dr. Scheele pointed out, for example, that able investigators of the terrible riddle of malignancy would be assured that their salaries were no longer reliant on the uncertainties of the year-to-year Congressional appropriations, and that thus there could be avoided the inevitable temptation to these people to abandon their research and laboratories for the greater financial rewards of private medical practice.

Mr. President, we are living today in a vast welter of political oratory, editorials, and articles about governmental economy. Yet I believe that economy which sacrifices research into the causes and possible cures of cancer is not economy at all, but instead a reckless gamble with human life.

If our people can spend \$15 billion on liquor and tobacco, if our Government can spend \$44 billion on armaments, if we can envision a disbursement of \$33 billion for roads, then we certainly can contemplate the long-range investment of at least half of \$1 billion into the invaluable research and studies sponsored by the National Cancer Institute.

Therefore, I submit this amendment to appropriate \$500 million now for the future work of the National Cancer Institute, which would provide that any unexpended portions of the total amount shall remain available until the doctors and scientists in charge of our cancer-research program have had a full opportunity to invest these funds appropriately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 26, line 24, strike out "\$46,902,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by me published in the Eagle magazine for February 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### "CRASH PROGRAM" FOR HEALTH

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

"Give me health and a day, and I will make the pomp of emperors ridiculous"—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

With one of America's most famous female radiologists at my side, I looked through the slittike glass window which had been niched in concrete walls 30 inches thick. Beneath a great coneshaped apparatus, a woman lay on a table. A bathrobe covered her body. The room was darkened. The tiny point of the equipment seemed to pick out her chest and throat. She was receiving radiation treatment from a "cobalt bomb" for deep-seated cancer. The mysterious roentgen rays made no sound.

Would the treatment be successful? Would it arrest the deadly march through

her system of malignant cells? Would she survive?

These questions flashed across the innermost frontier of my mind. Another question lurked there, too. Would the woman on the table ever know a moment's peace or contentment again? During her entire life, be it long or short, could she ever spend a fleeting hour free of anxiety and terror? Would each twinge of pain mean that the fatal killer had returned?

The woman on the table was obviously younger than my wife or I. What if it had been one of us on that table beneath the cone—the cone from which came the unseen rays that might mean a reprieve, if only the malignancy had been detected in time? Cold drops of perspiration dotted my forehead as I harbored these thoughts.

And yet, I mused how little we actually know about the rampant behavior of cells and tissue which men call cancer. The "cobalt bomb" was not a certain cure, even though nuclear fission had made it possible. It was a hope—a faint hope, though nonetheless genuine. And as I stood outside the vault of concrete and lead where the rays from a tiny inner cylinder of plutonium were working their mission which might mean life or death, I wondered why the richest Nation on earth was not investing more of its effort, resources, and wealth toward the possible liberation of mankind from cancer. Surely few battlefronts could be more crucial.

Cancer is a threat which hangs over us all from the bassinet to the tomb; yet we spend far less attempting to solve it than we do, for example, on the fittings for one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

As the radiologist and I peered through the narrow window at the young woman on the table, few things loomed as important as cracking the terrible riddle of cancer. All else—politics, money, personal ambition—faded into comparative insignificance.

What America needs today is a crash program of medical research. It should be a program proportionate to the \$40 billion which we seem able to spend annually on weapons of war. What war, after all, can compare with that against cancer, heart disease, mental disturbances, and other sinister maladies wracking mankind?

Mike Gorman, 43-year-old executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, points out that, despite its inadequate support from governmental appropriations, medical research during the past decade has added 5 years to the life expectancy of the average American. Translated into earning capacity alone, the people whose existence has thus been prolonged have paid seven times as much into the Treasury in personal income taxes as has been invested in the United States Public Health Service. And Gorman adds this further heartening note:

"In an age when the Communists and their satellites outnumber the forces of the free world by better than 2 to 1, medical research has bolstered our manpower resources and increased our productive strength. It has reduced immeasurably the tragic toll of human suffering."

Yet we in the Congress, as well as the public at large, still think in pygmy terms with respect to combat against disease. Unhesitatingly, we will spend billions for tanks or battleships or bombing planes. By contrast, we are stingy with mere millions when sickness is the enemy, rather than a foreign foe. And when we contemplate that the United States Government is spending \$48 million on the National Cancer Institute as contrasted with \$10 billion on naval vessels, we must keep in mind that it takes \$1 million multiplied 1,000 separate times to amount up to just \$1 billion.



Nor was even the \$48 million investment achieved for the onslaught against cancer without persistent and tireless effort on the part of certain Members of Congress.

When I was a candidate for the Senate in 1954, few topics held audiences more attentive than my insistence that Federal expenditures for medical research generally—and in the field of cancer in particular—should be increased many times. I even proposed an ultimate outlay of \$1 billion for cancer research alone, if necessary. This statement was repeated by me at trade unions, civic clubs, Eagle aeries, Grange halls, before veterans' groups, and women's organizations. It drew almost universal support and interest, especially when people learned that we were then spending \$63,980,000 on the Inter-American Highway and only \$24,978,000 on cancer research. Was greater knowledge of mankind's grimmest killer a mere 38 percent as urgent as the Inter-American Highway through distant jungles?

As a newcomer to the Senate, I have served as a private in the ranks of an all-out attempt to bolster our attack against the disease which is nearly the equivalent of a death sentence to all afflicted by it. Leaders in this effort were members of both major political parties—**LISTER HILL**, of Alabama; **WARREN G. MAGNUSON**, of Washington, and **WAYNE MORSE**, of Oregon, Democrats; and **MARGARET CHASE SMITH**, of Maine, and **EDWARD J. THYE**, of Minnesota, Republicans. Encouragement was received from **CARL HAYDEN**, of Arizona, a Democrat who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and has served in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union in 1912.

This bipartisan undertaking brought about the doubling of Federal funds available for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, from \$24,978,000 to \$48,432,000.

As we worked to achieve this goal, I thought of the fact that man has learned to conquer the air, the waters under the sea, to ascend Mount Everest, and even to influence the weather under certain circumstances. But cancer remains the inexorable assassin. Neither wealth nor fame nor power can stay its ravages. It killed valiant **Babe Didrikzen Zaharias**, Senator **Arthur H. Vandenberg**, Senator **Robert A. Taft**, **John P. Weyerhaeuser, Jr.**, of the vast timber corporation, and many others who still had much to contribute to American progress.

Although a crash program of medical research into the ominous roots of cancer would come too late to prolong their lives, perhaps it might help to spare the cancer victims of a later generation—in our own country and elsewhere in the world. Mercy knows no national boundaries.

**MARGARET CHASE SMITH**, only woman Member of the Senate, effectively emphasized the disproportionate sums which we spend on frivolities and on grappling with the most dreadful diseases plaguing the human race. Senator **LISTER HILL**, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling health funds, insisted that top salaries in Public Health Service laboratories be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000 annually. "The productivity of any research organization depends upon the quality of the staff," said Senator **HILL**.

Furthermore, during our discussion of health appropriations on the Senate floor, Senator **HILL** assured me that the increased funds for cancer research were not a goal in and of themselves but simply part of an on-ward march which must continue.

Partly because of the great impetus for an all-out program in the realm of malignant diseases like cancer, research expenditures by the Government for the fiscal year of 1957 also have been vastly expanded in other fields. The National Institutes of Health, located in Bethesda, Md., are now in the

midst of their most active 12-month period. Note this contrast in all major classes of appropriations:

	1956	1957
General operating expenses.....	\$5,929,000	\$11,922,000
National Cancer Institute.....	24,978,000	48,432,000
Mental Health Institute.....	18,001,000	35,197,000
National Heart Institute.....	18,898,000	33,396,000
Dental Health Institute.....	2,176,000	6,026,000
Arthritic disease activities.....	10,840,000	15,885,000
Microbiology activities.....	7,775,000	13,299,000
Neurology and blindness disease activities.....	9,861,000	18,650,000
Total.....	98,458,000	182,807,000

Thus, United States Government expenditures for medical research have been increased 85 percent in 1 year. Even teeth and gums had participated in the advance. Yet is this disbursement enough?

In Washington, D. C., our residence has been next door to that of **Dr. Leonard A. Scheele**, a tall 49-year-old man who recently retired as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. One sultry evening, seated in our patio over coffee and cake, I asked my neighbor: "Leonard, what is probably the maximum amount of money which the National Cancer Institute could spend in 1 year for research and study, if given reasonable notice in advance?"

The Surgeon General pondered for a moment. "Half a billion dollars," he answered. "What would be the usefulness of that quantity of money?" I asked.

"You would be certain that you could carry on your program from year to year without delay or interruption," **Dr. Scheele** replied. "Your top doctors and scientists would know their continued employment, at fair and adequate pay, was assured. They would not be tempted to break off their work to enter lucrative private practice. In addition, you could follow every possible lead or hope, no matter how remote or elusive it might seem. You would not have to budget so carefully and pursue only the most promising discoveries. In a war, the military often overspends because it might be fatal to the country to underspend. We could do that in the area of cancer research if we had a billion dollars or even half a billion dollars at our disposal.

The sums which **Dr. Scheele** and I discussed may loom as fantastic. But are they? Americans spend over \$15 billion a year on liquor and tobacco. They even spend \$280 million for chewing gum and \$116 million for shampoos. Why not twice as much for cancer research as for gum?

Whenever I urge a vast increase in Federal funds for medical research, people invariably inquire about the sums raised for this purpose by voluntary agencies. "Don't they do the job?" is the perennial question.

The voluntary agencies do a magnificent job. In 1954, for example, the American Cancer Society collected \$21,670,000 in private contributions and the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund an additional \$1,751,000. Organizations such as the Eagles, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL-CIO, and others have helped generously toward this private total of over \$23 million. Yet only \$7,189,000 of the private donations were allocated for research. The rest had to go—and properly so—for the treatment of pitiful and agonizing cancer cases in families lacking sufficient financial resources for their care. It is obvious, therefore, that the Government must carry on the major responsibility in cancer research, or it will not be carried on at all.

Research into all potentially fatal diseases, and particularly cancer, is one avenue for liberating mankind from a grim fear and a painful reality. Should our Government not share in such a responsibility? We would

scoff if some official in our town proposed that the fire department be entirely reliant on voluntary contributions. Yet which is the more imminent menace to the average person, fire or cancer? Ask a cancer sufferer.

Although I have been a legislator at both the State and national level, I still am unable to fathom the legislative mind when it comes to this vital human problem. Such famous Senators as **Taft**, **Vandenberg**, and **Wherry** have been fatally stricken by cancer. Yet the Senate will move with alacrity to vote \$4 billion for B-52 bombing planes, but it can cavil over barely more than 1 percent of this for cancer research. We will appropriate limitlessly to combat the foe we can visualize, whether it be the Soviets, Nazis, or Imperial Japanese. But stinginess and hesitancy cloud the picture when the enemy is an insidious disease which strikes silently and invisibly, but nonetheless murderously.

As a member of Oregon's House of Representatives, my wife had to struggle for almost 4 months to persuade her colleagues to vote a trifling \$80,000 for pilot courses aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. The lack of trained teachers and classes for these unfortunate youngsters brings heartache to thousands of families. It also dooms the children to lives of public dependency and helplessness. Skilled teaching can enable them to read, to play happily, to feed themselves, maybe even to work at a trade. Yet **Mrs. Neuberger**, herself a former teacher of physical education, found the legislature quicker to appropriate \$150 million for roads and highways than a tiny fraction of this for retarded children.

One night during the 1953 legislative session, when her retarded-children bill languished in committee, she said to me desperately. "It's easier to get funds for inanimate objects than for human beings. It hardly seems possible that human beings do the voting on these appropriations."

Yet this mental block on the part of legislators may be waning. Under the leadership of an Eagle Congressman from Rhode Island, **JOHN E. FOGARTY**, Congress has just allocated over \$2 million for programs aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. Another goal of the program is to try to discover why some children have congenital defects which render it difficult for them to lead normal lives. This sum is by far the most generous benefaction ever set aside for such a purpose. In his campaign for the children's funds, Representative **FOGARTY** had the active and fervent support of a fellow Rhode Island colleague, Congressman **AIME J. FORAND**. **Mr. FORAND** is likewise a faithful member of the Eagles.

Slowly but inevitably Americans are coming to realize that every dollar invested in medical research can be amortized in longer, happier, and healthier lives.

Some of this understanding is due to the leadership of a remarkable and attractive woman named **Mary Lasker**. She has used the fortune inherited from her late husband to encourage study of the ailments which cripple and kill people. The **Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation** gives substantial awards each year for achievements in the area of psychiatric and medical research. Writers and journalists, for example, are rewarded for outstanding contributions on these topics. **Mrs. Lasker** also helps to support such projects as the National Mental Health Committee and the New York Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

Each of us sees illness only as an isolated occurrence. It may happen to us or to a loved one. This is tragic, but we still do not see how it affects America as a whole. How many realize that mental sickness deprived our Armed Forces of over 2,500,000 young men

in the prime of life during World War II? Are we aware that more than half the hospital beds in the United States are required for mentally disturbed men and women, and that even these are not enough? On the Senate floor I pointed out that "almost two and one-half times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all our far-flung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action throughout 3 years of the war in Korea."

Medical research has begun to unlock some strategic doors. The Salk antipolio vaccine is a sample of what prolonged and well-financed medical research can accomplish. The vaccine is not perfect, but it provides children with 70 to 90 percent protection against the crippling havoc of infantile paralysis. We take for granted today such antibiotics as penicillin, streptomycin, terramycin, and aureomycin. All are the products of medical research. They have helped to reduce the death rate from tuberculosis 73 percent, from kidney diseases 60 percent, from pneumonia 43 percent. As a result, the life expectancy of the average American increased from an age of 60 in the year 1937 to 68.8 by 1953. Phenomenal new discoveries with respect to the fat content of diets may contribute toward cutting down fatal heart disease in the decade ahead.

These developments, it seems to me, are overwhelming arguments for vast expenditures in medical research. What can be more important than human happiness and human life? These are geared directly to good health. For a country spending \$40 billion a year for armaments, there is no sum too high to invest in the well-being of its citizens. I still recall what my wife, Maurine, said to me when she was fighting for a paltry \$80,000 in the Oregon Legislature, to spend in behalf of retarded little children.

"The beasts of the field on my mother's farm will do anything for their young," she said. "Can we look the next generation of human beings in the face if we have not done everything possible for them in the vital area of sound bodies and medical care?"

### THE BUDGET

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Monday the junior Senator from Missouri placed in the *Record* an article containing recommendations of the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the Military Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, about how this annual Federal budget could be cut many billions of dollars.

The next day an editorial on this subject appeared in the *St. Louis Globe Democrat*.

I had no idea this editorial was in the works; but its contents are so completely true with respect to the problem at hand that I ask unanimous consent it be inserted at this point in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of April 30, 1957]

#### HIGH COST OF DEFENSE WASTE, RIVALRIES

As the House Appropriations subcommittee on the military budget prepared this week to write the 1958 defense bill, Chairman GEORGE H. MAHON issued an urgent plea for a drive to start real unification of the armed services.

Congressman MAHON declared inordinate jealousy and rivalry among military branches are responsible for ballooning defense costs.

The current year's military budget is \$35,500,000,000. For the next fiscal year a total of \$38 billion is asked. Mr. MAHON predicted annual requested outlays would zoom to \$50 billion in a few years unless unification is achieved.

He is not being pessimistic. Despite denials by Pentagon spokesmen, the waste because of service rivalries, extravagant competition, inefficient buying and manpower practices is a capital scandal.

Estimates are these tax dollar losses run into the billions.

Not a single American wants to lower the power of United States defenses by a single jet, bomb or needed man. We must have a military potent enough to scare off any aggressor, equal and superior to any other strategic arsenal in the world. We dare not lower our defense arm.

But that does not mean the military budget is a sacred cow that can be milked steadily by inefficient organization, by bureaucratic brass feuding for position or supremacy in the defense structure.

It does not mean the American people have to hold still for obvious extravagance and refusal to accept unification of services.

It does not mean Pentagon planners are sacrosanct. It certainly does not mean the defense allotment—soaring by the billions—cannot be reduced by simple, businesslike organization and procedures.

Ten years ago Congress passed a military unification program, designed to take the fat out of defense costs. This act has not accomplished its purpose.

There is no excuse for the failure of the military branches to coordinate fully in the matter of purchasing, use of manpower, medical care.

Congressional investigations have shown the services still buy independently, often competing with each other for scarce materials, thus raising prices the taxpayers have to shoulder. Sometimes they stockpile goods other services have in surplus. The different arms maintain separate manpower and recruiting systems.

As the *Globe-Democrat* pointed out previously, the Hoover Commission reported that establishment of a single Federal Catalog System, with central Government purchasing, would save the Nation \$4,500,000,000 a year.

Some of the most intense and costly vying among services is in the field of missile development and aircraft pioneering. Various branches have tied up plane and missile manufacturers in an unwholesome competition for service supremacy—duplicating effort, prodigally absorbing the scarce engineering talent, often causing heavy losses.

In any huge operation, such as defense, some mistakes are bound to occur. That is true in business and industry, as well as in the military. But the systems, the jealousies and easy-handed spending of the defense setup breed enormous wastes. The generals and admirals deny this, but the evidence outweighs their protests.

President Eisenhower knows the score on military spending and waste. He probably knows it better than any individual in Washington, outside the Pentagon's inner sanctum. He has the prestige to crack down with a Commander in Chief's order for unification—real unification.

If he would do this—the task is admittedly tough—the defense budget could be pared by several billions without an iota of hazard to its effective power.

Every needed dollar for fully competent defense should be spent. But if the Nation does not cut out preventable waste from military operation, the defense budget will rocket out of hand and become a more acute danger to the Nation's economy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we are now talking about saving ten or twenty or fifty million dollars annually

at some particular place in the budget—and any saving of any kind is of course most desirable. But should we not face up to the place where many billions of dollars can be saved annually?

One reason given for this has been "there is no mileage in discussing military matters because the people trust the President completely on military matters."

But this is not a question of military strategy—it is a question of efficient operation; and there was nobody who believed more in more unification of the armed services a few years ago than President Eisenhower.

Only recently we had further concrete proof that great savings are available if some decisions are made. A report on defense manpower has just been made to the Secretary of Defense by the Cordiner Committee, headed by Ralph Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co. Mr. Cordiner states that if his Committee's recommendations are adopted it will save the country \$5 billion annually at no sacrifice whatever to national defense.

I do not know whether Mr. Cordiner is a Democrat or a Republican, but I do know that he is an able and seasoned industrialist; and it was therefore a shock to learn that his plan for saving this money for the American taxpayer has in effect been scrapped by this administration.

Mr. President, I understand the Secretary of the Treasury now wants to "curl" all the money back that was taken from his Department by the House; that the Postmaster General wants his money back and so also does the Secretary of State. But if we really want to reduce the current tax burden on the American people, we had better stop chasing minnows and start chasing shad; else we may well tax ourselves out of the free enterprise system.

I sympathize with anyone who is reticent on the basis of the old school tie. But there is one school tie tradition all of us wear, and that is the tradition of not wanting to be taxed unnecessarily.

### NATIONAL RADIO WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the observance of National Radio Week which will be held from May 5 to May 11. Radio is one of the great media of communications which are so vital to our daily lives. Radio is an important link between the people and their Government. In addition to many public services such as participation in national and community campaigns for civic improvement and vital information during times of disaster, such as floods or hurricanes, radio is a fine source of entertainment for many millions of listeners.

Radio also has an economic importance since it carries advertising which stimulates the business and industry of our country.

Some 3,000 AM radio stations and 500 FM stations, as well as the 4 nationwide networks, are taking part in the observance of National Radio Week. This observance is being sponsored by several organizations including the National As-



sociation of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Radio Advertising Bureau, the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, and the National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association.

As we all know, radio and television have made many alterations in our lives, particularly in the field of communications, since we were schoolboys.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this coming Sunday the Nation will observe the commencement of National Radio Week, May 5-11.

This fine occasion is sponsored industrywide by the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, the Radio Electronics Television Planners Association, and the National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association.

I should like to take this occasion to salute the 3,000 AM radio stations and 500 FM stations, as well as the 4 national radio networks.

As we are all aware, radio has had a spectacular upsurge in the postwar era.

Although there were some misguided folks who were predicting radio's demise because of television competition, the fact is that radio today is stronger than ever, in virtually all respects.

We have more stations on the air, we have more constructive news programs, we have more good music, we have more public service programming, and more of lots of other splendid features as well.

The prosperity of the radio industry is a welcome cornerstone in a prosperous free-enterprise system.

Radio plays an indispensable role in the advertising of America's goods and services.

Of course, radio has had to compete on an increasingly diligent basis with television. While radio advertising in some respects has declined, as in the instance of half-hour network shows, spot advertising—national and local—has soared.

In any event, we can be sure that our alert radio industry will give television and other media a good run for the advertiser's dollar, and in the meanwhile, will give American listeners the sort of entertainment and information they want and need.

There is, of course, another phase to the radio story, and that is the fact that there has never been a disaster—National, State, or local—where radio has not proven itself to be the vital link in the saving of lives and property.

In war and in peace, the radio set alongside us, the console model, the small set, and now the portables in increasing numbers, are irreplaceable pieces in every home and virtually in every room.

Production of radio sets continues to mount, despite the fact that the gloomy pessimists were long predicting that the market had been so-called saturated.

The fact is that there is an even vaster market than might have been previously anticipated in this and in many other respects.

I salute, therefore, America's 3,600 stations, particularly, of course, the stations of my own State. They confront a great many problems these days. The FCC is wrestling with a good many itself,

but I am hoping that there will be equitable solutions.

I know that the views which I am expressing today are shared by my colleagues. I know, too, that the people of Wisconsin would like to say a particular word of thanks to our stations, for all that the stations have meant in terms of contributions to wholesome community life—to farmer and city dweller, to housewife and student, to the well and to the bedridden, to the enthusiast of serious music and the jazz-fan of the disc jockey, to the businessman-sponsor and the workingman who buys products and services which are advertised on radio and who consumes them.

May National Radio Week prove another great success.

#### REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION FACILITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Federal Communications Commission a proposal which threatens to cut off all television reception for approximately 120,000 people living in 48,000 homes along the western border of Vermont, east central New York State and western Massachusetts.

In addition, more than 100,000 other viewers in this area will have to purchase costly conversion equipment which the FCC estimates will cost up to \$100 or \$150 per set, if they are to receive any television service at all.

The FCC describes this proposal as a reassignment of the existing Channel 6 VHF station from WRGB, Schenectady, to a television station at Syracuse, N. Y. The FCC would then replace the Schenectady Channel 6 with a UHF television channel.

For 17 years WRGB has been a very high frequency station, and by its pioneering efforts over these years it has attracted a viewing audience of more than half a million people.

For many of these viewers this is the only television channel that is available to them.

It is only one channel, but the difference between daily television service and no television at all.

Now it is proposed to take this one channel away from these people so that viewers in other areas may have 3 channels instead of 2. The Commission describes this proposal as a "deintermixture proceeding."

From the facts that I have obtained, I cannot understand nor in any way justify this proposed change, even under such an impressive name as "deintermixture proceeding."

In recent weeks I have been receiving a steady stream of mail from constituents who face the loss of all television service if this proposal should become effective.

Some of those who have written me are shut-ins, for whom television has become their primary contact with the outside world.

In addition, there are many persons who live in such small communities as Fair Haven and Poultny, Vt.; in Granville, N. Y., and the towns of western Massachusetts, along with the farmers

of this area, who feel that they have just as much right to the many pleasures of television as Americans residing in more populated areas.

The Federal Communications Commission has issued a report showing that a majority of the members of this important Federal regulatory body favor the juggling of channels which would result in this indefensible television blackout.

I recently wrote to the Federal Communications Commission to register my opposition.

In acknowledgment of my letter, Mr. George C. McConaughy, the Federal Communications Commission Chairman, wrote a letter of explanation which describes this proposal in some detail. It seemed to me to be an extraordinary explanation.

First he said:

Station WRGB is the only operating VHF station in the area.

Let me emphasize his use of the word "only"—the "only" VHF TV station now serving the people of western Massachusetts, east central New York State, and west central Vermont.

The Federal Communications Commission Chairman then explained that there are several UHF stations operating in the area now and numerous UHF channels assigned to this area, adding these significant words:

As a result of action we have taken in this proceeding, other UHF stations will be activated in the area.

I do not pretend to be an expert on such a highly technical matter as a "deintermixture proceeding," but common sense tells me that the Federal Communications Commission can keep adding UHF channels indefinitely and this action will not in any way relieve the blackout that will be caused by the removal of Channel 6 from the area.

I have learned on good authority that there are 120,000 people in 48,000 different homes who cannot receive these ultra high frequency stations.

Therefore the establishment of additional UHF stations will not help these people at all.

A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, and one functioning VHF Channel 6 bringing television into the area is worth many promises of UHF channels to come, particularly if the programs from the UHF channels cannot be received anyway.

I am convinced from the facts, as they have been presented to me, that the FCC should review this case with the greatest of care, and refuse to issue an order which would deny adequate television service to the people of this three-State area.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION DAY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is Senate Joint Resolution 22, Calendar No. 234. This joint resolution would designate the third Friday of May in each year as National Defense Transportation Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that this matter will not come before the Senate automatically until 2 o'clock, and that prior to that time it must be taken up either by motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was for that reason that I was about to make a parliamentary inquiry.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. I make the request because I know the measure is non-controversial and will be passed, I feel certain, without objection. It will cause no debate and will not delay the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] or the other Senators who wish to address the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may now proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has cleared the consideration of the joint resolution with the majority leader and the minority leader?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, after the resolving clause, to strike out "That the third Friday of May of each year shall hereafter be designated and known as National Defense Transportation Day, and the President is authorized and requested annually to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States" and insert "That the President of the United States is authorized and requested annually to issue a proclamation designating the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day, and urging the people of the United States," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested annually to issue a proclamation designating the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day, and urg-*

ing the people of the United States, including labor, management, users, and investors, in all communities served by any of the various forms of transportation by land, by sea, and by air, to observe this occasion by appropriate ceremonies which will give full recognition to the importance to each and every community and the people thereof of our transportation system and the maintenance of its facilities in the most modern state of adequacy to serve our needs in times of peace and in national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution, as amended, would authorize and request the President of the United States annually to issue a proclamation designating the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day.

A public hearing was held on this resolution by the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary on April 8, 1957. At that public hearing, representatives of the National Defense Transportation Association testified in favor of the proposed legislation.

This resolution, by requesting the President of the United States to set aside a day each year to be known as National Defense Transportation Day, will provide an opportunity for the transportation industry of the country to emphasize transportation preparedness for national defense. The resolution further calls on the President to urge the people of the United States in all communities served by any of the various forms of transportation by land, by sea, and by air, to observe this day by appropriate ceremonies which will give full recognition to the importance to each and every community and the people thereof of our transportation system and the maintenance of its facilities in the most modern state of adequacy to serve our needs in times of peace and in national defense.

The committee is of the opinion that this is a meritorious resolution, and that the designation of a day to be known as National Defense Transportation Day will serve to bring to the attention of our Nation the vital importance of transportation in any national emergency which might hereafter arise. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 22, as amended.

There was no objection of any kind to the joint resolution at the hearing or in the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Wyoming. I thank him publicly for the work he has done in holding hearings on the joint resolution.

The National Defense Transportation Association is an excellent organization. Its purposes are of the highest. I am certain that when the day shall be set aside it will be of great benefit to the people of America.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Maryland. I should say that he is the author of the joint resolution, and that it is he, not I, who deserves the commendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution requesting the President to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day."

#### LATIN AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES: NEW DIMENSIONS IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for the past half-year our attention has been riveted to the turmoil in the Middle East. There Communist subversion has exploited growing economic desires and fervent nationalism to create chaos. There the eyes of the world appear to be focused, as every headline, every newscast, almost every speech dwells on the facts and prospects of the changing tides in the Middle East. While we have been concentrating on the rapid-fire developments in the Middle East, Latin America—right here in the Western Hemisphere—has been experiencing similar widespread ferment and unrest. But because it is not at the moment in the direct geographic path of the Soviets, developments in this area receive scant attention. Yet the pot boils down there.

Reports from South America, Central America, and the Caribbean have been increasingly troubling. In recent weeks the Chilean Government has had forcibly to suppress mass rioting. In Haiti, a discontented populace forced the overthrow of the president. The country is presently without a government, and several days ago police fired tear-gas bombs at demonstrating crowds in the Haitian capital. In Cuba, only 45 minutes from the United States, revolutionaries stormed the presidential palace, seeking to assassinate President Batista. Reports from Cuba of continuing revolutionary activities reach us daily. The provisional government of General Aramburu, in Argentina, which is striving to reestablish free government after a decade of Peron, is constantly plagued by Communist and Peronist plots. In northern South America, Colombia bristles with violence and insecurity. The Liberal and Conservative Parties have put aside their differences to join forces against the strong-arm methods now prevailing in the country. If the president goes ahead next month with his plan to succeed himself, contrary to Colombian tradition and constitution, some observers expect a repetition of the bloody 1948 riots of Bogotá.

The wave of internal strife sweeping Latin America is not the only problem in the Western Hemisphere. Late last week, there were reports of a Nicaraguan invasion of Honduran territory. The territory in question has been disputed for many years. Recently both countries have moved troops to the area. Some observers attribute the reawak-



ened interest on the part of both governments to the fact that United States oil companies have been prospecting in the vicinity.

There is continued talk and speculation that our long-time friends and allies, the Panamanians, are watching with great interest Colonel Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal, and his success at cutting himself in for a bigger "take" from the operation of this international waterway. These are festering, developing matters which should command our immediate attention.

Mr. President, we cannot be complacent with regard to Latin America on the economic front, either. The habit of lumping all 20 republics together in statistical reports can be, and is, deceptive. It is true that last year considerable capital investment flowed from both United States and European sources into Latin America. It is also true that the region's foreign trade and industrial expansion reached record levels in 1956. Latest reports indicate, moreover, that Latin America's gold and liquid dollar holdings rose during the first 9 months of 1956 by some \$177 million.

A breakdown of the figures shows that not all the countries fared well in the reported progress. Mexico, Brazil, Venezuela, El Salvador, and Cuba had a prosperous year. But not all our neighbors were so fortunate. Argentina's reserves plunged by some \$137 million, while Colombia's reserves dropped by one-third in less than a year. In fact, 1956 saw Colombia develop the worst economic crisis in its history. Inflation wracked the Paraguayan economy. Bolivia suffered what amounted to economic chaos last year. The boliviano, pegged at 720 to the dollar in 1953, reached 7,360 to the dollar by mid-1956.

Guatemala, the little nation in Central America where Communist infiltration was rooted out over 2 years ago, was having a hard pull to prove that democratic government and free enterprise can bring a better way of life to the underprivileged. President Castillo's reversal of the former government's land-distribution program has caused a number of difficulties. The new plan calls for the return of expropriated land to the original owners and the relocation of land-hungry peasants in new community developments on nationally owned coffee fincas and in virgin jungle territory. Unfortunately, this type of agrarian reform is handicapped by insufficient funds to build the necessary roads, drainage systems, community centers, and to clear land. The poor peons who benefited from the wholesale division of expropriated properties under the Communist-dominated regime are waiting to see what free enterprise can bring to them. In the case of the only country which has purged a Communist-infiltrated regime, the progress of Guatemala is being watched by underdeveloped countries the world over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida has mentioned Guatemala. It is all very well to speak of getting rid of a government, if the reforms referred to by my good friend, the Senator from Florida, are carried out. But does the Senator from Florida know of a single instance in which Guatemala has benefited from the so-called reforms?

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico; the reforms which were instituted by the government which preceded that of President Castillo did not result, I believe, in any benefit at all to the natives of Guatemala.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have visited Guatemala, and I think I am familiar with the situation in Latin America generally. I believe I know the reactions and the characteristics there. I know that the Grace Lines and the United Fruit Co. are doing well; but the Guatemalan woman is still walking from Amatitlan to Guatemala City.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his contribution. I believe he will agree that that is the reason why, in connection with the vast foreign-aid appropriation bill which soon will be before us, more consideration should be given to the Guatemalans and to other peoples of the Western Hemisphere, who thus far have been rather neglected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely. So far as international economic improvement is concerned, we have treated the peoples of Latin America—from the Mexican border to Patagonia—like a bunch of orphans. Talk about satellites. They may not be political satellites, but certainly they are economic satellites, with few exceptions.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Senator from Florida will emphasize the necessity of doing something for the Western Hemisphere. I do not confine my attention to Latin America; I refer to all of the Western Hemisphere, from Hudson Bay to Patagonia. We discuss aid of various sorts for the Middle East and our interest in the future of the Middle East. But after the Senator from Florida and I have gone, the future of our country will lie in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from New Mexico. I hope that both he and I will be here for some time. However, I agree with him that even today our future lies in that area. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for his remarks, and I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. President, I have just been handed an Associated Press dispatch which has just come off the wire. It further emphasizes the ferment and restlessness which are occurring. The dispatch reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The United States declared "grave concern" today over the clash between troops of Honduras and Nicaragua and declared its readiness to take part in an international peace commission or any other move for a settlement.

Matters of that sort can be headed off if we give to the countries in that area of the world, which have been our good neighbors, and which mean so much to us, at least some of the attention which they deserve to receive from us. If we do so in time, there will not be the disputes and clashes which, unfortunately, we read about today in the press.

Meanwhile the Communists, although busy elsewhere in the world, have not abandoned their efforts to subvert Latin America. The widespread publicity given to the brutal Communist suppression of the Hungarian revolt struck a blow to the Communist effort south of the Rio Grande. But it was only temporary, and there has been no letup in Communist endeavors to capitalize on the widespread social conflict and awakened nationalism under which many of the Latin American republics are laboring.

The combination of social transition, nationalism, and Communist intrigue is as explosive a mixture in Latin America as anywhere else on the globe. After the Guatemalan experience, there can be no grounds for belief that the Western Hemisphere is immune from Communist penetration and subversion. The conditions which made possible Communist penetration in Guatemala are duplicated in other parts of the hemisphere.

I am convinced that we have too much at stake in Latin America to trust to a benevolent destiny there. We must work harder to ease the tensions in the Americas than the Communists are working to create them.

It is well to recall that the Middle East is not the only oil-producing region in the world. Latin America produces nearly a billion barrels of oil a year, about 16 percent of the world's total, compared with 15 percent in the Middle East. Of course, in known reserves, the Middle East far outstrips the Latin American area, but to date most tracts south of the Rio Grande regarded as promising by geologists remain unexplored.

Nor is oil the whole story. Latin America is our principal supplier of many raw materials vital to defense and to peacetime industry. United States private investments in the area last year climbed to over \$6.5 billion, more than in any other region of the world. Our two-way trade with the American republics ran to over \$7 billion.

The emphasis which the State Department puts upon crisis spots elsewhere in the world, while letting Latin American problems slide, can lead to future disaster in Latin America. No one can predict, of course, what course Latin America's tremendous political, social, and economic upheavals may take. The United States, as the preponderant power in the Western Hemisphere and as leader of the free world, can and must help our sister republics to channel the course of their development toward constructive goals, or else be prepared to suffer the consequences.

Moreover, it is a highly precarious gamble to take international friendships for granted, as we seem wont to do with

our neighbors. The Kingdom of Jordan recently provided us with an example of how deceptive a so-called sure thing can be in international affairs. Jordan, created under British tutelage and with over half of its annual budget supplied by the British Treasury, rewarded Britain by pushing out the British commander of its armed forces and generally ripping the bonds which only a few years ago appeared to be irrevocable. If, at the moment, we are inclined to feel a degree of satisfaction with the good will and friendship existing between the Latin American republics and our country, it would be foolhardy to believe that this state of affairs can continue under any and all circumstances.

Under the circumstances—turbulence in the region, Communist activities there, and our vast stake in the political and economic progress of the area—it is difficult for me to comprehend why the administration left the key post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs vacant since the resignation of Henry Holland on August 31, 1956. Only this month—8 months later—has a nomination for the position been submitted to the Senate.

I might say that Mr. Rubottom has been recommended for the post of Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Rubottom is a Texan. He is an able man, in my opinion. He is a career diplomat, with a splendid record. I hope the Senate will shortly confirm his nomination. I believe that if Mr. Rubottom will exercise the independence which any Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs should exercise, if he will stand up and speak his piece in behalf of the Latin American countries, as I have no doubt he will, he will make a great Assistant Secretary of State, and will do a great deal toward cementing better relations between the countries of Latin America and ourselves.

Mr. President, it is hard to fathom the apparent disinterest and complacency on the part of the Department of State with regard to our relations with Latin America. I introduced last July, and the Congress passed, an appropriation for a special fund aimed at assisting our sister republics in the vital basic fields of health, education, and sanitation. It was a relatively small amount, \$15 million, 75 percent of which had to go out on loan; 25 percent could go on grant. Last December I visited Central America, and was astounded to learn that none of the countries had even heard about the program. In fact, it was not until this past February or March, 1957, that a decision was reached within the Department of State as to how the program was to be administered. The machinery of operation for this program was thereafter not set up until very recently, so that for practical purposes about a year was wasted. My judgment is that this slowness of administration was due solely to the fact that the program was one the Congress had to force on the State Department and the ICA, and because they had not originally recommended it, but actually opposed it, they were at first determined to administer slow death to it. However, after visits with the new Under Secretary of State, Mr.

Herter; Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Rubottom; ICA Administrator, Mr. Hollister; and Dr. Atwood, also of ICA, together with a very strong push from the very able and distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the program finally began to function.

When the Latin American countries found out about this Congressional program designed for them, they literally ran over each other to get this limited help. The applications in short order exceeded the supply. I must say that in recent weeks, Dr. Atwood and his deputy, Mr. Minot, have done effective and expeditious work in putting the program into motion and in applying it to those whose need was most immediate. For this action which we have seen in the last few weeks I think Dr. Atwood and Mr. Minot deserve commendation.

Bear in mind that the total amount of money available under this program is only \$15 million. It was allocated in the following manner: Two grants totaling \$2 million have been made; one was to the Organization of American States for agricultural research in the amount of \$500,000, and the other to the Panamanian Sanitary Bureau in the amount of \$1.5 million. The latter grant is to be used in the battle to eradicate dreaded malaria from the hemisphere. It is estimated that national expenditures by the Latin American governments in the same campaign will exceed \$26 million for the year. The disappearance of malaria from the American scene would relieve some 76 million people who live in malarious areas from the severe effects of the disease in terms of human suffering and financial and economic drain. The malaria-eradication campaign is in the great tradition of inter-American cooperation against disease began by Drs. Walter Reed, United States Army, and Carlos Finlay, Cuba, in their joint battle against yellow fever, which was started many years ago.

Of special interest are the several loan agreements made under the terms of the amendment and signed earlier this week. One of the first to be signed was an agreement with Panama for a loan of \$2 million for the construction of water and sewage works in the city of Panama. President Ernest de la Guardia told me last fall that the problem of sanitation and sewage disposal was of paramount concern to him. He pointed out to me that it was a problem that also affected United States citizens living in the Canal Zone, and that a solution to it was necessary for the welfare of both United States citizens as well as Panamanians living in the city of Panama. The project was engineered and planned in 1951, but action was stalled for lack of funds. Panama is now putting up \$1.815 million, and has agreed to repay the loan in 20 years with 3 percent interest.

The loan being made to Costa Rica is especially heartwarming and promising. Like the Panama agreement, this is a loan, payable with interest. It is for \$2 million, the money to be used to rejuvenate the children's hospital in San Jose. Presently there are about 400 children

in a 200-bed hospital which has grown up over the centuries. The Costa Rican Legislature demonstrated its enthusiasm for the loan by passing enabling legislation in 3 days. Moreover, news of the loan created such local interest that the Government was able to raise a public subscription of \$180,000. The Government, in the meantime, has budgeted for the hospital for the next 10 years. It is hoped, moreover, that improvements in the children's department will lead later to improved techniques in other hospital branches. A United States Embassy dispatch characterized the loan as follows:

It is doubtful whether it would have been possible to find any other cooperative project which would create more good will than this one.

Healthy children, good will, and a thoroughly cooperative venture—what greater bargain could we hope to achieve with our foreign aid? Remember, too, that this is a loan, not a grant. It is the vital catalyst for making much-needed modernizations, while at the same time maintaining everyone's self-respect.

In Chile a series of fortuitous circumstances made the terms of the special fund uniquely suitable. There exists in Chile a core of highly trained scientists and technicians, but too few to supply the minimum needs of the country. Moreover, they lack properly trained supporting personnel. In addition, the paucity of scientific publications, journals, and properly equipped research laboratories makes it difficult for them to keep up with the latest developments in their respective specialties and to develop other technicians.

Recognizing the need to increase the number and improve the quality of adequately trained scientists and technicians, the Chilean Congress in 1954 enacted a law which created the universities' construction and research fund. The law provided that, from January 1, 1956, and for a period of 20 years, one-half of 1 percent of all government revenues shall be devoted to the fund. The money allotted to the fund is to be spent in the construction, equipment, and installation of experimental stations, laboratories, and other institutions devoted to scientific research in the seven universities. Administration of the fund is entrusted to a council of rectors composed of the rectors of the seven Chilean universities.

One of the first steps taken by the Council of Rectors was to request technical assistance from the United States mission in Chile for the planning and implementation of a scientific and technological research program. An expert from the National Research Council was sent to Chile to make a preliminary survey of the country's needs. Then Dr. Ralph Krause of the Stanford Research Institute made some followup recommendations to the Council of Rectors, a principal one being that the future of scientific and technological research in Chile depended upon intensive scientific training at the undergraduate as well as graduate levels.

There was great enthusiasm for carrying out Dr. Krause's recommendations.



But the ever present question of how improvements were to be paid for arose. At this point the Council of Rectors, unofficially and without reference to any special United States fund, approached the ICA mission in Chile on the feasibility of obtaining a loan to implement Dr. Krause's recommendations. Fortunately, at this time, the amendment to the Mutual Security Act for fiscal 1957 had been passed, and the project eminently qualified for a loan under the terms of the act.

On Monday the Chilean Government signed for a loan of \$850,000. Part of the funds will go toward establishing a central library for the seven universities. About \$700,000 will be expended for modern equipment, instruments, and materials for the laboratories of the seven universities. The ICA mission in Chile considers the new project, and I quote, "a brilliant opportunity of furthering good relations among Chilean institutions of higher learning, the United States Government and other agencies, thus helping to counteract the Marxist influence that has been in evidence in some of the Chilean universities." If the materials made available under the loan improve scientific training in Chile, I will consider the project of extreme importance in aiding in the long-range economic development of the country and its political and economic stability.

Mr. President, I think it could be well stated at that point that it is unbelievable to me, after their people have said these kinds of things about this program, that ICA would somehow continue to oppose this particular amendment.

Two million dollars for a very different purpose has been lent to Peru. In Peru there is grave fear that population pressures on the congested altiplano, accentuated by drought and by its accompanying hunger and despair, will lead to permanent poverty and social upheavals. Meanwhile, Peru possesses rich agricultural lands which lie fallow because they have never been penetrated by roads. The loan is to be used to open land for resettlement of thousands of Indian families. The Peruvian Government will undertake all the costs of building the settlers' housing and facilities and easing the transition period for the settlers' families until the farms become productive.

Again may I remind you that this is a loan, payable in 20 years with interest. Yet it provides the Peruvian Government the opportunity to give hope to a large, depressed segment of its population that might otherwise seek a violent solution for its otherwise hopeless status quo.

From the special fund for Latin America, Ecuador is also to receive a loan of \$2 million for financing an imaginative land resettlement project, while Paraguay is the recipient of a \$1 million loan for agricultural and industrial development in its exemplary Mennonite colonies.

I feel we have made a beginning on a valuable new type of assistance to our Latin American neighbors. Rather than watch from the sidelines as conditions deteriorate, we have found a mechanism

for attacking some of the basic problems of our friends. In the last analysis, the United States stands to benefit enormously from the increasing prosperity and stability that will accrue from each small seed of help that we extend.

I cannot repeat too often that these are loans, not handouts. This is the type of assistance the Latin Americans have been urging for a number of years. It is the type of assistance that will help them in achieving their objective of political and economic stability. It is the type of assistance that will promote minimum standards which will create an atmosphere that will attract the investment of private capital. Until these minimum standards are achieved, private investments will not flow into these areas. No one desires to invest capital in any area where disease, pestilence and illiteracy are major factors. It is therefore highly improbable that private investments would do anything about health, education and sanitation projects, for there is no immediate and direct monetary return in promoting them. Private investment today is attracted to only those countries in Latin America where at least minimum standards have already been achieved in these fields. These are few countries indeed. As a matter of fact, over 69 percent of private investment is in five Latin American countries, namely, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, and Venezuela. We must remember that there are 15 other Latin American countries, many of whom have not been able to develop an atmosphere which would attract private capital. Yet it is exactly in these fields that many of the Latin American countries are badly in need of temporary assistance, and where the loans provided for under the amendment which I introduced last year will be most effective. We want to rely on private capital to develop these areas but certain minimum health, education, and sanitation standards must be met before conditions are propitious for private capital. It is these minimum standards we are trying to achieve in Latin America by this amendment.

Mr. President, in connection with that, there is very little that we have thus far done, as was pointed out by the very able Senator from New Mexico.

I have here an article which appeared in the Miami Sunday News on April 28, 1957, written by an estimable columnist by the name of Bill Baggs. He points out some figures which I think would be appropriate to mention.

To begin with, the aid in 1956 cost us \$1,200,000,000.

Here are some figures, the economic aid totals in 1956 to countries in Asia:

South Korea, \$211,000,000.  
South Vietnam, \$192,800,000.  
India, \$80,900,000.  
Formosa, \$96,500,000.  
Pakistan, \$66,300,000.  
Iran, \$40,000,000.  
Laos, \$36,600,000.  
Cambodia, \$26,200,000.  
Thailand, \$24,800,000.  
Turkey, \$86,900,000.  
In Europe, the three largest receivers are:  
Spain, \$87,700,000.  
Greece, \$45,700,000.  
Yugoslavia, \$43,100,000.

And he states:

One could argue, and many have, that these great amounts are justified in this nervous world.

However \* \* \* not yet has the writer heard an argument of any merit that this is a balanced aid program. For instance, the members of the family, so to speak, are the other 20 Republics in this hemisphere. They have been regarded as not needing aid. Indeed, they have not asked for it, but the need is immense. Our own friends and neighbors in this hemisphere need aid as much as most of the places in Asia.

Yet, in 1956, typical of the aid which dribbled south, was:

Mexico, \$800,000.  
Cuba, \$400,000.  
Colombia, \$1,100,000.  
Argentina, \$100,000.  
Uruguay, \$200,000.  
Venezuela, \$100,000.  
Brazil, \$3,000,000.

He says:

This Sunday report is neither a plea for an economic aid program nor a case against one.

Rather, it is a suggestion that ours is an unbalanced economic aid program, ignoring our very best friends, the Latin Americans, who have pleaded our cause in peace and have helped to fight our battles in wars. We have no better friends. But you can find no suggestion of this friendship in the economic aid program.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Sunday News of April 28, 1957]

TOO MUCH SCRATCH FOR IKE'S ITCH?

(By Bill Baggs)

Lately Mr. Eisenhower has lost his immunity to public criticism, and among his recent lumps none has been as large as the one inspired by his economic aid program. Certainly you should be interested, if not fascinated, by his economic aid program. You are providing the scratch for this itch.

Readers frequently flee from any arithmetic report. Possibly this is a lingering rebellion from school days. For whatever reason, it is a fact, that there simply is no other road available down which one may travel to see the picture of the economic aid program.

To begin with, the aid in 1956 cost us \$1,200,000,000.

After prospecting through the national budget of 1956, one finds that this money was invested in the management of foreign armies and air forces as well as foreign economies.

One of the primary impressions of the American is that a slab of this is handed over to our British cousins. This is false. Most of the foreign aid travels halfway around the world to Asia.

Here are some figures, the economic aid totals in 1956 to countries in Asia:

South Korea, \$211,000,000.  
South Vietnam, \$192,800,000.  
India, \$80,900,000.  
Formosa, \$96,500,000.  
Pakistan, \$66,300,000.  
Iran, \$40,000,000.  
Laos, \$36,600,000.  
Cambodia, \$26,200,000.  
Thailand, \$24,800,000.  
Turkey comes in for \$86,900,000, and in Europe, the three largest receivers are:  
Spain, \$87,700,000.  
Greece, \$45,700,000.  
Yugoslavia, \$43,100,000.

One could argue, and many have, that these great amounts are justified in this nervous world.

However, not yet has the writer heard an argument of any merit that this is a balanced aid program. For instance, the members of the family, so to speak, are the other 20 Republics in this hemisphere. They have been regarded as not needing aid. Indeed they have not asked for it, but the need is immense. Our own friends and neighbors in this hemisphere need aid as much as most of the places in Asia.

Yet, in 1956, typical of the aid which dribbled south, was:

Mexico, \$800,000.  
Cuba, \$400,000.  
Colombia, \$1,100,000.  
Argentina, \$100,000.  
Uruguay, \$200,000.  
Venezuela, \$100,000.  
Brazil, \$3,000,000.

This Sunday report is neither a plea for an economic aid program nor a case against one.

Rather, it is a suggestion that ours is an unbalanced economic aid program, ignoring our very best friends, the Latin Americans, who have pleaded our cause in peace and have helped to fight our battles in wars. We have no better friends. But you can find no suggestion of this friendship in the economic aid program.

Mr. SMATHERS. Before long Foreign Aid Appropriations will be coming before us. They need to be put into better balance. Many of us, and justly so, are in a mood to carefully examine the proposed expenditures, and cut where not fully justified. While I propose to oppose foreign aid in some instances, I am convinced that the small amounts presently being provided for Latin America, far from being in excess, barely fulfill the minimum requirements of an effective program for the Western Hemisphere. I am equally convinced that the new approach to foreign aid developed in the special fund for Latin America, which we passed last year, is a significant and worthwhile innovation. Here in the Western Hemisphere, where international cooperative procedures in economic and political matters are being tested, we have a real chance to make freedom and prosperity a true bulwark against communism. We can do this by continuing the type of assistants which I proposed last year and which the Congress adopted for Latin America. It is a program in which we can effectively assist our neighbors to help themselves in solving their difficulties. It is not a foreign-aid program in perpetuity. I am unalterably opposed to any such program. It is a specific program, developed for limited purposes and a limited time. It is a program designed to promote minimum standards which will attract the investment of private capital. It is a program with respect to which we can see the end in sight. It is a program that represents an investment by the United States, the results of which will be realized when these various Latin American countries have achieved political and economic stability.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to compliment the Senator upon his fine address and to commend him for his interest in

our South American neighbors. With the existing situation in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, I believe that too often these days we overlook programs for the nations to the south.

The Senator has been a wonderful friend of our South American neighbors. He has done much to establish better ties, and I think he has rendered fine service in presenting his address and the program which he has suggested today.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am very grateful to the able senior Senator from Tennessee for his comments. I may add that he himself has long evidenced a great interest in the part of the world to the south of the United States. I know that the people in that area count him as one of their good friends. I know that when the amendment designed to facilitate the lending of money in Latin American countries comes before the Senate the Senator from Tennessee will support it, as he did last year when that subject was considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Tennessee. The project which the Senator from Florida is promoting is very worthwhile. He has been urging action along this line for a long time, and I assure him that I think the program is very important. I shall do what I can to assist him in promoting such a program.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Arkansas is a very influential member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the past he has evidenced a great interest in the southern nations. With his continued support, I believe we shall be able to get at least a minimum program for our Latin American neighbors passed. Certainly his strong voice in behalf of it will mean a great deal.

#### THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET, AND REDUCTIONS IN THE BUDGET

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have noted with deep regret the attack upon Mr. Percival Brundage, the Director of the Budget, made before the chamber of commerce yesterday, in which, according to this morning's paper, his resignation was called for. I particularly regret that the attack was made by a Member of the Senate, who made it, he said, "without prejudice to President Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect."

I regard Mr. Brundage as one of the most enlightened and discriminating and courageous Directors of the Budget that we have had in a long time.

It is quite evident to anyone who glances even casually at the budget that real, substantial reductions can be made only by trimming some aspect of the swollen and extravagant Defense Establishment.

It seems to me to be quite unfair to suggest that eight or nine billion dollars can be cut without reducing military appropriations.

That being so, whose responsibility is it to suggest cuts in the military budget?

Especially is this so when the President and Commander in Chief is a famous general.

Why should Mr. Brundage, an enlightened and civilized man, with a deep understanding of national and international affairs, be singled out for condemnation, and the President excused from any responsibility. That on its face seems to me to be extremely unfair and unwarranted.

The implication that the President is being led around by his subordinates seems to me also unwarranted.

I deeply regret that such a personal attack has been made upon a fine public servant, the Director of the Budget.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF PHOSPHATE ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 269, Senate bill 334, a bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 334) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader whether the matter has been cleared with the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]?

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand it has been cleared by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

#### HORATIO ALGER AWARDS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has become a familiar story, in election years, of the rise of men from humble beginnings to positions of great public trust. I am proud to say that my own career has paralleled this typically American story. For my parents were immigrants who came to a new country, raised a family, and in the great American tradition, after having served in World War I as an enlisted man who was commissioned in the field, I returned to set up a small bakery with my brother. It was from this baker's bench that I came to Washington first as a Congressman, and now serve here as a United States Senator.

So I am pleased that the story of businessmen who have followed the same course should have been, at long last, recognized by the American Schools and Colleges Association by the Horatio Alger award, which is just 10 years old this year. From the many thousands of men who have risen from humble beginnings,



they select each year a chosen few who best epitomize the American tradition and at the same time prove their right to such recognition by their own contributions to America and their home communities.

Next week, May 9, in New York, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, chairman of the Horatio Alger Awards Committee, will present five such awards to men who follow in the footsteps of Herbert Hoover, Bernard Baruch, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower. Numbered among them will be two men from my own State.

The first is Louis Zahn, who began his business career helping out with the family's finances. He sold chewing gum at the age of 6, in Chicago. Then he had a newsstand. In 1932, when thousands of others were discouraged, he borrowed \$225 and started a drugstore. Today he heads his own \$10 million drug chain.

The second man, Dr. John J. Sheinin, is closer to my heart, for he fled from his native Russia during the Kerensky revolution, in which he was very nearly shot. Penniless and unable to speak English, he yet reached his goal and became a doctor. As head of the Chicago Medical School, he found similar problems, for the school was not recognized by the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association. He brought the school through that stage, and today, after 25 years with the medical school, it is recognized and successful, turning out students who achieve top honors before national examining boards.

If ever two men symbolized the Horatio Alger awards, certainly these two Illinoisans do. It is my proud pleasure to bring their records to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress as modern reminders of the great country in which we live, and in which opportunity still lies ahead for men of ambition and vision, no matter how humble may be their start in life.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the completion of the morning business and the consideration of the executive calendar, there be a call of the calendar, from the beginning, of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so

that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have waited some days before speaking to the subject to which I intend to speak today, in order to proceed with the subject very carefully, and also in the hope that perhaps it would be taken up by other Senators, as in part it already has been. I believe the time has come to marshal into perspective our present situation in respect of the administration's action on the budget, and what needs to be our action in Congress.

The battle of the budget has been joined also as the battle of the administration. Second thoughts on the budget are now due. There is no question about the deep interest of all our people in economy in Government, minimizing the effect of Government spending on inflation and reducing the tax load as far as practicable.

I think we should be cognizant of the fact that under the cover of the great public interest in budget cuts, however, may now be discerned other interests regardless of party, who seek a return to a long-outmoded isolationism in foreign policy and entrenched opposition to any Federal participation in health, housing, education, and similar programs now accepted as standard by a great majority of our people. That is perhaps best shown by the fact that a budget cut in the area of \$2 billion to \$3 billion is widely accepted as practicable. Indeed, the President himself in his letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on April 17 specified where \$1,858,000,000 could be cut without endangering our country and the peace of the world. Many have spoken on the subject, including the minority leader of the Senate.

But cuts of up to \$3 billion do not constitute the real issue. The real issue is made by those who could cut the budget about twice that, or from \$5 billion to \$9 billion, who speak in terms of "give-aways" about foreign aid, and who oppose needed Federal participation in programs for domestic wellbeing.

Even within the Republican Party there is reference to those who in substance support the President's efforts to deliver to the people what was promised in the campaign of 1956 and in the Republican Party platform as "modern Republicans." Modern Republicans are sought to be identified with the Democratic Party's New Deal and Fair Deal wing, apparently in an effort to discredit the very principles and programs on which this Republican administration was returned so overwhelmingly to office last November. I respect the sincerity and standing of those who espouse a position in fundamental disagreement with

the President, but I cannot disregard my party's platform and the pledges of support for it on which I and so many of my colleagues ran and were elected.

There is no hyphenation or qualifying adjective applicable to Republicans who back President Eisenhower. He is the President of the United States and the leader of the Republican Party. He is the symbol of Republicanism today and of the people who supported his philosophy, his principles, and his programs last November. That is today's Republicanism and the Republicanism I espouse, and I deeply feel the opponents of it, not its supporters, it seems to me, need to qualify their identification with the party.

I hasten to add that those who support the President cannot expect to agree with him on every measure. But support does contemplate agreement on the President's basic political philosophy and a high percentage of support for the resulting programs. I believe that the effort to identify supporters of the President's program and the Republican Party's 1956 platform with the New Deal and Fair Deal is inaccurate, a disservice to the Republican Party and indeed I feel, does not help the American people.

A primary declaration of the 1956 Republican platform adopted in San Francisco states that—

We are proud of and shall continue our far-reaching and sound advances in matters of basic human need—expansion of social security—broadened coverage in unemployment insurance—improved housing and better health protection for all our people. We are determined that our Government remain warmly responsive to the urgent social and economic problems of our people. To these beliefs we commit ourselves as we present this record and declare our goals for the future.

I think it is very important to note that in the 1956 campaign, the President pledged himself and the party to carrying out this platform. On the eve of election at the White House, November 5, 1956, the President stated:

We believe that government must have a heart as well as a head. By this we mean that government must concern itself in pointing the way and leading the way to those great social security programs, to the health of our people—the education of our people—to make certain that all these are available as an average American citizen has a right to expect them.

I believe we must respect our pledges and the mandate of the American people to do our share in carrying them out.

I think it is fair to say that the Republicans who follow President Eisenhower favor Government action where it can be effective and achieve useful objectives without compromising individual liberty or the private economy. We do not believe, however, in rejecting action solely on the ground that it emanates from Government.

There are opponents of programs of foreign aid and Federal aid to school construction and similar measures in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. It is only because those who support these programs in both parties are willing to combine to vote them that they have been heretofore, or are likely again to be, enacted. Nor should we for

a moment forget the extent to which it is out of character to characterize the Democratic Party alone as the arch advocate of budget cutting. In view of the record of the previous Democratic administration, which I will outline, few will believe—or, I might say, few ought to believe—this characterization to be other than a strictly political conversion for the duration of a Republican administration only.

In practice, Republicans who follow Eisenhower consider Government, insofar as it undertakes programs affecting the individual—aside from the administration of justice, customs, defense, foreign affairs, and other functions traditionally associated with Federal sovereignty—to be useful as a coordinating and stimulating medium. I should like to give a few examples. An excellent one is Federal aid for small business development through the establishment of a Small Business Administration to assure small business its fair share of defense contracts, of technical assistance, and of direct loans where small business cannot get them through normal commercial channels and strong anti-trust action to free competition. The strictures that this administration is being conducted by big business or for big business are being completely exploded, in my view, by this hard fact.

Pending in Congress right now are two bills for Federal aid to school construction—one is the administration bill, the other is the so-called Kelley bill which I believe represents the so-called New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy. The Kelley bill calls for a large per capita distribution based primarily upon numbers of pupils in the States. The administration bill calls for helping primarily those States which cannot help themselves. I happen to believe that the administration bill should be somewhat larger in amount, but the fundamental principle of the administration bill is right and represents the kind of thinking which is typified by President Eisenhower's leadership of the Republican Party.

We have another example in the health field. It will be remembered that the New Deal-Fair Deal proposal was for a great system of Government insurance, with medical service to be provided by Government-paid doctors. The Eisenhower brand of Republican thinking resisted this idea on the grounds of its devastating effects on the traditional relationship between doctor and patient. Now this national governmentally financed health program is obsolete, due to the fact that more than 100 million Americans carry some form of health insurance or participate in private voluntary health plans. What is needed now—and this is the Eisenhower approach—is help to enable these health plans to extend their range of coverage and to provide assistance for older people, the indigent, the unemployed, and others who are not valid actuarial risks. In short, the Government would be filling in the vacant places created by the private system rather than trying to replace or displace the private system.

Among other indicia of today's Republicanism is the backing of determined civil-rights action. It supports full uti-

lization of the executive authority to achieve the fullest freedom of opportunity regardless of race, color, or creed for all our people.

Again, I sincerely commend the distinguished minority leader for his forthright leadership upon the civil-rights issue in this Chamber.

Without a change in the Senate rules, which is one of the ornaments of this body, to make it possible to end filibusters, the prospects for civil-rights action in Congress are greatly jeopardized.

Today's Republicanism backs an immigration policy consistent with the needs of the anti-Communist struggle and our free-world leadership. The President has sent his recommendations to Congress on that subject.

I am deeply convinced that the very same millions of our citizens who are interested in the most economy possible in the budget and the lowest possible taxes are at the same time equally interested in all of the things that the Government proposes to do in the budget. These include national security and defense, housing, education, health, aid to the aged, aid to needy children, aid to agriculture, development of our natural resources, and that element of our security which is inherent in the bipartisan foreign policy of which foreign military, economic, technical assistance, and exchange-of-persons programs are a vital part.

In his recent budget letter to Mr. RAYBURN, the President stated that the Federal Government "should undertake only essential activities that the people cannot sufficiently provide for themselves or obtain adequately through private voluntary action or local or State government." The President ran and was elected on this basic premise.

That letter, sent by the President to the Speaker of the House, was vitally important to me not only for what it said on reducing the budget but also for what it did not say. The President refused to abandon the Republican Party's 1956 platform, and I urge my colleagues in my party not to abandon either the principles or the programs which have been proven by popular acceptance to reflect the thinking and the aspirations of the vast majority of the American people.

Let us examine in some detail the Eisenhower administration budget, and consider what it means in terms of the national economy.

It is essential to note that in the fiscal years, 1952-55, until the Eisenhower administration could really take hold, the Federal Government ran at a deficit of \$20,700,000,000, largely based on what had been accumulated from the previous administration. This was reflected in an increase in the national debt in the same years by \$15 billion.

On the other hand, beginning in fiscal 1955-56—in other words, ending June 30, 1956—we have had a \$5 billion reduction in the Federal debt, out of surpluses, including the estimated surplus of \$1,800,000,000 for the next fiscal year, even with the current budget allowed in full. In the same period, too, there has been a remarkable stability in the cost of living and a substantial increase in

living standards estimated for the American people.

Figures compiled by the Department of Labor show that the real spendable earnings of factory production workers in March 1957, were over 20 percent higher than the 1947-49 average.

The real test of the budget and expenditure is not only what we spend, but also what we earn. And the gross national product of the United States has risen from \$360,700,000,000, for the full fiscal year when this administration took over, to an estimated \$425 billion for fiscal 1956-57, an increase of well over \$60 billion, or 18 percent.

Mr. President, it is very significant that this year the Federal budget will take a lesser percentage of the gross national product of our people than that represented by the increase in the years during which the present administration has been in power. Here are the figures: In 1953, the Federal budget amounted to 20 percent of the gross national product. In 1957, it had dropped to about 16 percent, and it is expected to remain at that figure in the fiscal year 1958, as well. In short, while we have a solid determination shared by the President, the minority leader, and many others in high authority, to cut this budget as much as it possibly can be cut—and an estimated \$2 billion to \$3 billion seems to be in sight—Republicans should not be intimidated, by being called "modern Republicans," into accepting a return to "1890 thinking" in our party.

In addition to the \$1,850,000,000 in cuts specified by the President, it may be possible to effect a further cut in defense expenditures, although the effect on general employment by the sudden withdrawal of big orders for planes, ships, and other defense materiel and the need for maintaining defense-production facilities must both be watched, in the interests of our general economy.

Let me mention some of the places where cuts may be made: Rivers and harbors projects call for appropriations of \$647 million. In fact, in the last 3 years, Congress has appropriated 4 percent or \$73 million more than the President asked for. In this part of the budget, there is a lot of "pork barrel" which could and should be cut.

The Post Office estimated deficit in the budget is \$651 million. The President asked for an increase in postal rates which would add \$654 million a year, and would cancel the deficit, and would cut the budget by that much. But this calls for an increase in first-class-mail rates from 3 to 4 cents, and we must decide whether we wish to pay that increase in mail rates in order to save on the budget.

Also we can scrutinize carefully the number of civilian employees in the Federal Government, now about 2,500,000; and we can guard against undue increases. Of course, one of the policemen in that field is the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Two areas in alleged budget cutting, however, indicate what I have said, namely, that those with special interests are seeking, perhaps unwittingly, to lead us back to an outmoded and dangerous isolationism, in the course of the budget debate—a debate and the scrutiny it re-



flects which I think are both wise and proper. Those of us who feel strongly on this subject should willingly join issue on basic policy decisions on major matters involving our fundamental security, but we should not permit the questions to be decided by money alone. I speak of the slashing cuts advocated in foreign aid, and also of the cut of \$35 million already made in the House of Representatives in the \$140 million requested appropriation for the United States Information Agency—a cut over which the President expressed “deep concern” as damaging “a key instrument in our efforts to promote peace.”

Foreign aid and the USIA should be subjected to the greatest scrutiny, of course. Indeed, the President has suggested that the military aspect of foreign aid be cut back from \$2,450,000,000 to \$1,950,000,000, a cut of \$500 million. But this is quite different from branding the foreign-aid program generally as a giveaway, and proposing to eliminate completely economic aid, and to cut military aid drastically. These programs, of which the USIA is a vital component, are keystones of our free-world leadership for peace and freedom over communism.

Foreign aid and the USIA which are said to have no constituency in this country fighting for them, which is why they are said to be so vulnerable, I think they ought, indeed, to have the greatest constituency fighting for them of any in the United States, because they are such vital ingredients in our winning by peaceful means the historic struggle against communism.

Mr. President, we are not living in a vacuum. We are living in a grim, life-or-death, epoch-making struggle between ourselves and communism, which is the antithesis of our way of life and of everything we think worth living for. The aim of our national policy is not to resolve the struggle between freedom and communism by an atom and hydrogen war. We hope to resolve it by the excellence of our performance, our moral standards, and the force of our argument for freedom; by such means, we hope mankind will be persuaded that freedom is best. Considered in terms of our success in preserving mankind, even more depends on these elements of our foreign policy—which include foreign economic assistance and the Information Agency—than on the \$38,500,000,000 budgeted for the Armed Forces, vital as they are.

Mr. President, I have said that we are living in an atmosphere of very tense competition, and indeed we are. I hear very much talk about living in a vacuum, rather than about living in the condition in which we actually live. Let us see what others are doing in this respect.

By way of comparison with our efforts, it is reported that the Soviet Union is selling its ideology with an expenditure, at the very least, of \$236 million for radio propaganda and publicity for distribution abroad. In fact, figures—which are, of course, hard to obtain—nevertheless indicate that the Soviet Union for 1953—the last year for which I have been able to obtain such statistics—spent \$1,657 million, and, with its satellites, an esti-

mated \$3,400 million, for propaganda and culture.

Mr. President, this morning I contacted USIA for a more up-to-date estimate of how much Russia is currently spending for her giant propaganda network. It was informed she spends somewhere between \$500,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000 each year—and that figure does not include the very considerable cost of *Isvestia* and *Pravda*, the Communist newspapers. It does include funds for Radio Moscow, TV, propaganda movies, leaflets and similar activities.

Obviously, Russia is not only willing to spend, but in fact already is spending some nearly 10 times the current budget for USIA, in an all out effort to sell the Communist ideology to the world.

This does not mean that the budget of the United States Information Agency should not be scrutinized with the greatest care, like that of any other agency. But I think it does mean that the United States Information Agency should not be punished by deep budget cuts.

Let us test this out on the cuts already made by the other body. We find the following situation. To maintain the work of the agency at least at the level of the current fiscal year would require \$116,600,000—adding to last year's appropriation \$2 million to cover mandatory Civil Service requirements, and \$1,100,000 as the first installment on the Mideast radio transmitter. Instead, the Agency has been allowed \$10,300,000 less. In addition to the restoration of this \$10,300,000, \$18,600,000 is needed for increased activity of vital importance to our country in the current phase of the cold war. Let us not forget that the Soviet Union is about to launch a new campaign under the guise of coexistence, and yet at this very moment we seem to be moving toward cutting down instead of building up our counterattack.

I think we ought to get very specific. I examined carefully the debate in the other body and the committee hearings. I have come up with some specific matters which I should like to put into the RECORD, because that is the only way in which we can be realistic. I can be just as hardheaded as anybody who wants to cut the budget to the bone.

Of the \$18,600,000 requested by the Information Agency to expand its activities, half is for stepped up information work in Africa, in the Near, Middle and Far East, and in Latin America. The USIA wants to open more reading rooms, libraries, and 15 new information posts and subposts abroad—10 of them at key points on the powder-keg continent of Africa, which is a priority target for the Communists. Now, when there is a feeling of good will toward America and Americans in the newly independent nations of Africa such as Ghana, let us work not only with the Africans, but among them.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator took a trip around the world after the election in 1956. I wonder if the Senator had an

opportunity on that trip to visit those reading rooms and libraries and information posts to which the Senator has referred in his speech.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for that question. I did. I found them to be very fine examples of American life. I found them to be very popular in countries with teeming populations, such as India and Pakistan. I do not think we can begin to understand their hunger for reading matter, because there is very little entertainment and very little they can afford to buy along that line.

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because, while I have not had the advantage of world travel, I have talked to friends who have. They have made very favorable comments about the reading rooms and the libraries, which are outstanding functions of the United States Information Agency. I am glad the Senator is pointing that matter out in his address today.

Mr. JAVITS. The Agency asks another \$2,300,000 to enable it to produce and distribute hundreds of hours of new programs for the greatly increasing number of television stations. I think we ought to build the stations up, not tear them down. We say our agencies should be awake. They are awake, because the march of television is forward, not back. Today, USIA sends television programs to some 200 stations abroad, but it estimates that by July 1958, 200 new television stations will exist. In Japan alone, the number of stations will more than double. In Latin America, 57 new stations will start; in the Near East, 7 more are expected; and in Europe, 109 new stations will join the 135 now operating.

Another \$1 million is needed for new programs in Eastern Europe, including increased distribution of the magazine, *America Illustrated*, so that we cannot only continue to distribute the magazine in the U. S. S. R. for the next year, but also reach behind the Iron Curtain with an additional language version of the magazine. Anyone who has seen the slick publications put out by U. S. S. R. for distribution in our country must recognize how vital is the publication of *America Illustrated*.

The Agency needs nearly \$1,500,000 to produce more than 7 million books in both English and translated editions to be sold primarily in the Near East, Far East, and Latin America. Designed to sell commercially through local outlets for about 10 cents each, these books about America are portable good will ambassadors which students can afford to buy, read, and then pass on to family and friends.

I might say one thing I learned when I was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Foreign-language books are one of the staples of the Soviet propaganda drive which we must meet. Particularly is this true in a country like India, which, if there is any place in the world where it is true, is the focal point of the struggle between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Foreign-language books are one of the staples of the Soviet propaganda program which we must meet, particularly

in countries like India, where books are expensive and people hunger for them. If they do not get ours, they will get those of the Soviet Union. It is high time we remember that.

Added to these items is the cost of increasing the output of motion pictures—primarily to the underdeveloped areas of the world where illiteracy is high—our overseas exhibits such as "Atoms for Peace"; and the President's "people-to-people" program, estimated to cost \$500,000.

A good case is made out for the restoration of about \$29 million of the House cut in the appropriation for USIA.

In terms of our own security, the evidence is that we should continue the foreign-aid program. Indeed, two such highly qualified and impartial observers as Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York, and Harold H. Held, chairman of the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank, one of New York City's great banks, testified to the importance of our foreign-aid programs just the other day.

Cardinal Spellman reported the worldwide need for relief supplies was "appalling," in a speech before the Bishop's Fund Appeal for Overseas Relief. I quote the word "appalling," used by one of our great newspapers. Mr. Helm reported, as a result of a recent trip abroad, that he had become further convinced that continuation of American aid in the Far East at its present level is not only desirable, but necessary.

Many in this Chamber think our Vice President is a hardheaded fellow, too, and very recently he called marked attention to the need for economic aid in the report on his historic African tour; and in a speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce, one of the leading organizations in the country urging extensive budget cuts, the Vice President stuck by his guns.

Let us see what foreign aid we give abroad. Let us get down to the facts. Let us be as hardheaded as those who advocate deep budget cuts say they are.

Under present programs, about \$600 million a year is expended for economic and technical assistance abroad by our Government, apart from expenditures for foreign military assistance and its economic element of defense support, which constitute the bulk of the \$4.4-billion budget request for foreign aid. Only \$600 million is left for economic aid for development, and even this \$600 million is cut in half. Why? Because \$300 million of the \$600 million actually moves to benefit directly the great majority of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries other than countries such as Korea, Formosa, Turkey, and Vietnam. They get \$300 million of this development assistance, and there even nonmilitary economic assistance is directly tied into the overall maintenance of the national security, which is so vital to our own defense, as we have shown by the way we handled those countries.

Mr. President, to meet the epochal Communist challenge seeking to exploit depressed standards of living, health, sanitation, and housing in the underdeveloped countries, we need to find a way in which our country—taking to-

gether what the Government does and what private interests do—can mount an effort of the magnitude of \$5 billion a year for economic and technical assistance. I hasten to add that this sum should include a doubling of the rate of overseas private investment from the present annual amount of something under \$2 billion net in the fields in which overseas private investments traditionally operate. Our aim should be to do this job mainly through the private sector of our economy, but to do it we need to continue and strengthen—not cut off—such governmental foreign economic and technical assistance as we now give.

First, because in such matters as public health, government administration, the work of private voluntary and nonprofit agencies, and the development of roads and similar public works governmental assistance must be supplied. That is the only way the objective can be reached in these overseas areas.

Second—and I know this again from my experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy in the other body—because business itself feels greater comfort in its own activities abroad when the Government continues its assistance. Indeed, to continue at about the present level is just about the finding of the President's advisers on the mutual-security program, under the chairmanship of one of our country's leading industrialists, Benjamin Fairless, formerly the president of the United States Steel Corp. And Secretary Dulles' proposals of \$750 million in revolving loan funds for foreign aid move in the same direction.

Mr. President, let us understand two things. Many people like technical assistance and, they say, they do not like economic aid. But in practically every country, if technical assistance is to be effective, there must be economic aid. The best example is the so-called village development program, which is the greatest single contribution in India, to keep the people on the side of freedom, which has now reached 80 million people in India directly and personally in their own little homes. I visited these villages, and saw enough of a sample to state that as a fact. This is a program which is now interesting Pakistan and Burma and other areas so vital to us. They need not only technical assistance, but they need the little bit of money they receive, which represents a jeep, or a roadmaking machine, or an extra supply of seed, or a cast iron stovepipe, which revolutionizes cooking in the home and takes the odors out instead of spreading them within. That takes a little bit of economic aid each place, but when it is all added together it is \$300 million, the amount I have named as actually being used for this purpose, and it goes a very short way indeed.

Mr. President, in this, too, the Russians are competing with us. Not only are they competing, but they are competing on horseback. It is estimated that they will be giving a billion dollars—not \$300 million, but a billion dollars' worth of economic aid in this very fiscal year, when we are making a tremendous noise about the fact that we may be giving

\$300 million. They will be giving aid to Afghanistan and to Egypt and to Syria and other countries vital to our interests.

Mr. President, let us not forget that foreign aid has been continuously carried on since 1947 by overwhelming majorities in the Congress despite exactly the same assaults which are being made upon it now. I am not speaking now of the exact amount involved. We may cut a few hundred million dollars or we may not, but I am speaking of a program of the magnitude of that which is proposed to the American people for fiscal 1958. I am talking about a program of that magnitude. We might trim a bit here or trim a bit there, but I deeply feel that is the order of magnitude we need in the interest of our national security, and it needs to remain about the same. I deeply feel that our people are firmly convinced and committed upon the subject of continuance of the foreign aid program as an essential element in the security of the United States so long as the grim Communist specter stalks the free world.

Mr. President, in summary, our obligation is responsibility to the country and its security. Those who call the loudest for the deepest and the biggest budget cuts and tax cuts will condemn us the most—and I think quite rightly so—if we forfeit our responsibility for the security of the Nation, the ultimate triumph of freedom over communism, the historic effort to avoid atomic war, and the further development of domestic security and well being for the individual, commensurate with the vigor and productivity of our private economic system.

The role of our Federal Government is to help coordinate and facilitate security and well being for the individual without compromising our basic private economy and freedom. This I am convinced it can accomplish. This should be the rule for Republicans and Democrats alike. In my party, I am proud to be aligned in substantial support of a President who stands for and was elected upon this political philosophy, and, Mr. President, I intend to fight for that philosophy in the councils of the Senate, no matter how sensitive the issue, including the budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included as a part of my remarks an interesting editorial from an upstate journal, the Buffalo Evening News, on the USIA, entitled "Keep the Voice Effective," and a column on the same subject written by David Lawrence, appearing in many syndicated papers, entitled "Meat-Ax Budget-Cutting Methods," published April 18, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 23, 1957]

#### KEEP THE VOICE EFFECTIVE

The methods of carrying America's message to the outside world have been disputed for years. And, whatever apparatus is employed, it will never satisfy everybody. Least of all, the Members of Congress who must vote the funds to keep it in working order.



The House has cut the United States Information Agency's budget by about 26 percent in spite of President Eisenhower's plea against drastic reductions in funds. The Senate may restore some of it, but it isn't likely the entire \$144 million—the requested appropriation—will be authorized.

The usefulness of all of USIA's activities has been questioned and will be questioned again. It has been characterized as a gigantic boondoggle. The President doesn't think so and we agree wholeheartedly that it should and must be continued. As with so many other essential agencies, however, we are not at all sure that a big budget means a better operation. Certainly there have been enough stories of waste and extravagance in the USIA to warrant the hope that it can be made a more effective voice for America even if it is put on a slenderizing diet.

Mistakes have been made in the content of American propaganda to the outside world. It has been compared unfavorably to the straight-news approach of the British Broadcasting Corp. But under direction of Arthur Larson, its new chief, there is evidence that the Voice of America and affiliated agencies of the USIA will adopt a policy of less propaganda and more uncolored news in broadcasts and literature.

There is another field in which the United States can tell its story to the peoples of nations overseas—the world trade fairs that are held each year in Europe and more remote parts of the world. The House Appropriations Committee has sliced deeply into the funds which go to display our industrial supremacy overseas—reducing an \$18,500,000 request by \$7,600,000.

Until 3 years ago, it was a standing joke abroad when the great and powerful United States didn't have exhibits at such world trade fairs which play a large political as well as commercial role in world affairs. While we were either absent or represented by a display of negligible dimensions, the Soviet Union really spread itself in lavish and spectacular exhibits. The United States Government entered the field in 1954 and since, at every fair wherever on the globe, consistently has made the Russian entries look shabby. That this performance enhanced United States prestige cannot be questioned.

The next fair is to be held at Poznan, Poland, scene of the beginning of the Polish revolt last summer. Plans for United States participation are almost complete and there will be no skimping on our exhibit. Its importance is obvious. But, if the budget cut made by the House committee sticks, several others of equal importance will have to be skipped. We sincerely hope the Senate will find somewhere else to save this \$7,600,000 instead of taking it out of as effective an instrument of American foreign policy as the trade fairs program has proved to be.

#### MEAT-AX BUDGET CUTTING METHODS—PRESENT CONGRESS SEEMS INDIFFERENT TO COLD WAR PROPAGANDA NEEDS

(By David Lawrence)

Billions for war, but a mere pittance for the dissemination of ideas that could influence peoples abroad, restrain capricious rulers, and prevent war. That's the curious result of the meat-ax method of cutting the budget which seems to have been adopted by the Democratic Party that controls Congress today.

The proposed cost of armament runs to \$38 billion. It is a vital part of the Federal budget, because it is counted on to help deter potential enemies from attacking the United States and its allies.

But less than one-third of 1 percent of what is being spent for armament now has been appropriated by the House of Representatives for the United States Information Agency, which has the main responsibility

for transmitting the American viewpoint on peace throughout the world.

A cut of \$38 million just made by the House of Representatives leaves the United States Information Agency \$106 million for next year. This is \$7 million less than was voted for the current year. Yet the problems of the Middle East and the Far East are no less critical than they were, and the task of cementing relations with our allies in Europe has not by any means diminished in importance.

In an atomic age it is imperative that peoples everywhere should influence their governments to refrain from precipitating a world war. But peoples must have the facts and the information on which to form judgments. Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of how difficult it is to penetrate the public opinion of foreign countries realizes the enormous task that faces the United States Information Agency.

Soviet Russia spends billions where America spends a few millions in communicating with other peoples, especially in the areas of most strategic importance.

The United States is relatively new at the business of exporting ideas. Some mistakes have been made—but not as many perhaps as in the doling out of billions to foreign governments to help rehabilitate their economic structures since World War II.

The objective—to prevent the spread of international communism—is admitted everywhere in Washington to be worthwhile. But when it comes to supplying the necessary funds to carry on that phase of the cold war, Congress seems indifferent.

This is not because of partisanship alone. There are other factors. One is the lack of familiarity of Members of Congress themselves with the many influences that are operative every day in foreign lands to check American diplomacy and threaten the defeat of our efforts to win the friendship of other peoples.

The Soviet auxiliaries among the intellectuals are numerous in many countries, and the press is actually controlled by agents of Moscow in various parts of the world where the United States Information Service is trying to offset Communist propaganda. It's a battle that America cannot afford to lose, and it takes money to fight that kind of warfare.

The United States Information Agency makes available free, for instance, the texts of important American pronouncements of policy because the newspapers abroad couldn't possibly afford to pay the heavy costs of cable tolls to get those speeches transmitted. There are literally dozens of other worthwhile projects which are designed to inform the peoples abroad concerning America's peaceful intentions and her humanitarian interest in the welfare of other nations. Instead of encouraging this work, Congress is shortsightedly discouraging it.

Unfortunately, some Members of Congress set themselves up as expert judges of how the United States Information Agency should be conducted. It is, of course, a specialized field. The hearings recently held show a woeful lack of knowledge by many Members of Congress of what it is important to do to win the cold war.

It is shocking to any American who travels abroad to discover how little is known about the United States even in the English-speaking countries. Very few newspapers and periodicals are sent from America to other countries—only a few thousand here and there. The vast population of the rest of the world has a scant knowledge of America's purposes and policies. As a consequence, the distortions distributed by the Communists have to be challenged again and again. If Congress doesn't furnish the necessary money to the United States Information Agency, the growth of anti-American sentiment will go unchecked.

Ideas are transmitted in modern systems of communication in a variety of ways. The printed word is important, but so also are radio and television and motion pictures. Many millions who are illiterate may not be able to read books or newspapers, but they do look at movies. The potentialities of the various means of communication are limitless. Yet the House of Representatives has actually cut down the program of the United States Information Agency and evidently prefers to give a clear field to the Communists in this cold war. Will the Senate do likewise?

What the House has just done is a tragic development—a failure to recognize that war can be prevented only by getting peoples to reject the policies of dictators and by winning the hearts and minds of peoples. Ideas are plentiful, but money to convey them is almost as necessary as any other deterrent force.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the able Senator from New York upon the superb address he has made this afternoon for the benefit of the Senate and for the people of this country. I hope they may have the advantage, throughout our States, of understanding the philosophy of the Senator's address today.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has brought to bear on this very important issue an accumulated knowledge, experience, and understanding of this budgetary question, with particular emphasis upon the foreign-affairs aspect of it. I think he has made for us one of the most penetrating addresses I have heard this year on the subject of the budget, with which we are about to deal.

I am very happy to congratulate the Senator. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to make some further remarks myself which, in a large measure, will support the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much for his kindness. I have a very high regard for his thinking and his patriotism. I am very grateful for his very kind words.

Mr. President, might I ask the Senator to further yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am willing to yield briefly for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, before that is done, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, who would like to make a comment on the address of the Senator from New York.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to say that I was prevented from being here at the time of the speech of the distinguished junior Senator from New York. Very kindly he presented me with a copy of his speech earlier in the day. I had occasion to read it. I consider it a great speech, one which deals realistically with the problems of the budget which we face, and one which supports the President of the United States in his aims. I

congratulate the distinguished Senator upon his speech.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for his kind remarks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to express my own conviction that the Republican Party must remain responsive to the needs of the American people in an expanding and dynamic economy, and in a world of tensions in which the Soviet Union still menaces freedom everywhere.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has gone into many phases of this question in a very thorough and brilliant fashion. As I stated earlier, I hope his remarks may have the very widest circulation, because not only has he acutely recognized some of the important problems which we face in connection with this budget discussion, but he has brought to bear on them his experience and his facility in dealing particularly with the mutual security elements of the budget. We are all very grateful to him for clarifying the issues to the extent to which he has clarified them. I know that we shall hear more from him on that subject in the days to come.

The American people are rightly concerned over the size of the proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1958. When expressed in terms of current dollars, the total of \$71.8 billion—exclusive of the highway and other trust funds—is, indeed, startling.

Reflecting the concern of the people, there has been much criticism in the Congress of the President's budget. Some has been informed and responsible; much has been reckless and partisan.

There has been criticism expressed on both sides of the aisle in this Senate.

Addressing my remarks at the present time to some of my Democratic friends, I may say that I have been somewhat amused by their belated conversion to the cause of economy. I hope that conversion is sincere, and that there will be no backsliding into the free-spending errors of their past.

But to one who examined the Democratic Party platform in 1956, perhaps some skepticism may be permitted.

If Adlai Stevenson had been elected last year, and had attempted to carry out his party's platform pledges, he would have been forced to advocate spending programs which would dwarf those of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

There was no limit but the sky on Federal spending called for in the Democratic platform.

Now it is time to put the President's budget in proper perspective.

In terms of a stable dollar, the budget is below the level of 4 years ago and less than the average for the last 6 years.

And, when we compare nondefense spending with national income, the results are startling. The 1958 budget proposes to take only 7.5 percent of the national income for nondefense programs, as compared with 10 percent in 1950 and 11 percent in 1939.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article which was published in the May 3 issue of the U. S. News & World Report, entitled "Why United States Budget and Your Own Budget Are So Big."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of May 3, 1957]

#### WHY UNITED STATES BUDGET AND YOUR OWN BUDGET ARE SO BIG

Glance behind the latest budget figures and you find this—

What's happened to the Government's budget in the last 10 years turns out to be pretty much the same thing that's happened to your own family budget.

Both have grown steadily, but inflation, rising costs, accounts for most of their growth.

Take away the effects of inflation, and Federal spending is almost unchanged from levels of recent years.

Family budgets, meanwhile, are up nearly 40 percent in the same decade, with nine-tenths of that rise the result of inflation.

The growing agitation over President Eisenhower's budget of nearly \$72 billion—a record for peacetime—now is leading many people to take a fresh look at Government spending.

The facts disclosed by this closer scrutiny have come as a surprise to many.

What has happened to the big Federal budget in recent years, it is being discovered, is the same thing that has happened to the budget of an average family or of a typical business. Inflation is the key.

Prices, wages, charges for all sorts of services that the family or the Government buys have risen spectacularly in the years following World War II. Spending increases, in large part, are thus the result of price increases, not of purchasing increases.

When you take out of the usual budget picture the effects of inflation, you find this:

Government spending in terms of real dollars of equal buying power, has been unusually stable now for several years.

While spending of these real dollars will rise in the year that starts July 1, this spending will remain below the level of 4 years ago—President Eisenhower's first full year in office.

Spending of ordinary dollars of today will be up, numerically, next year to a level nearly double that of 1947. Yet real spending—or purchasing—will be only about a third larger than in 1947.

Since 1940 the rise in annual budget outlays has been a spectacular \$62.7 billion. Yet only \$21.5 billion of this—or about one-third—is real in terms of what Government has been able to buy. About \$41.2 billion—or two-thirds of the rise—is money that is going down the inflation drain.

This view of the budget is about the same as the one a family gets when it takes a close look at the situation and learns that, with perhaps twice as much income, the family is enjoying very little more of the good things in life than it did 10 years ago.

You get, in the accompanying charts prepared by the economic unit of U. S. News & World Report, a clear picture of the effect

that inflation has had on the budget of the United States Government and on the budget of the average American family in the period since World War II.

Government's budget in the year that ended in mid-1940—just before World War II—came to a total of \$9.1 billion of spending.

By 1947, after spending heavily in war and then cutting back, Government was spending \$39 billion. But these dollars did not have the same purchasing power as those of 1940.

In real terms of 1940 dollars Government in 1947 was spending \$22.8 billion.

Budget spending, in other words, had jumped from \$9.1 billion to \$39 billion—up by nearly \$30 billion. Yet real spending had gone up from \$9.1 billion to \$22.8 billion, or by \$13.7 billion.

Less than half the spending rise was real. More than half was the result of higher prices.

For the year that starts July 1, Government's spending budget is estimated at \$71.8 billion. This is a rise of 84 percent from 1947.

In terms of real dollars of 1940 vintage, however, spending next year will come to only \$30.6 billions. This is a rise of less than 35 percent from 1947.

You find, too, that, in the period since mid-1953, Government spending of real dollars has been pretty stable. In these terms, spending is to be at about the same level—or only slightly higher—in the year that starts July 1, 1957. It will, in fact, be lower than it was in 3 of the preceding 6 years, and less than the annual average for those 6 years.

Spending, in other words, is on the rise, but only about in line with price rises that are occurring.

Ordinary families, too, have found themselves spending more and more dollars for what, in many cases, turns out to be no more of goods and services.

Take the spending of the average family—or household—in this country, as computed from reports by the United States Departments of Labor and Commerce.

In 1940 the average family spent \$2,009 for all the things that a typical family wants and needs.

By 1947 the average family was spending \$4,042—double the outlay in 1940.

Now look at this change in terms of real dollars of the same buying power and you get an entirely different picture.

Measured this way, the family's spending in 1947 had risen from \$2,009 to \$2,659—or by about one-third. A great many of the family's dollars, along with Government's, were going down the drain.

Now, after another decade or so of rising costs, even more dollars are being claimed by inflation. In the year starting July 1, the average family will spend an estimated \$5,551—nearly 40 percent more than the 1947 outlay.

In terms of real dollars—in purchasing power—the family's spending has risen since 1947 from \$2,659 to \$2,766, or by only 4 percent.

The average family, it becomes clear, is putting out a lot more dollars numerically without getting much more prosperous.

Prices, again, are the reason. The new car that the family bought this year cost about \$2,800, instead of the \$1,950 or so the family paid in 1947. The home that could be bought for \$10,000 right after World War II now sells for around \$14,000.

Everything Government buys—or nearly everything—has gone up in price in the same way.

For an example of what has happened since a 1940 dollar bought a dollar's worth of goods or labor, look at what has befallen the Armed Forces.

In the days before World War II, the average member of the forces received pay and allowances amounting to \$1,289 a year. Now,



that average is budgeted at \$3,767—nearly 3 times what it was in that earlier day.

Back in 1939, the United States was buying its best fighter planes for \$60,000 apiece. Now, Government is budgeted to pay \$1.5 million for each fighter plane. Where a heavy bomber cost \$300,000 in 1939, Government now is paying \$8 million for a single bomber.

These, of course, are not the same planes that Government was buying in 1939. They are bigger, faster, far more complicated and loaded with expensive gear. Atomic weapons, electronic equipment, other things needed to fight a modern war also take more time and labor to produce than did the fighting gear of 1939.

These products of rapid technical development are adding to the cost of Government in much the same way as price increases. A businessman, in an age of automation, finds the same thing to be true of his operation. So, too, does a family that tries to stretch its income to cover all sorts of automatic equipment for home and car.

President Eisenhower's view of these trends sounds pretty much like that of any family that has taken the trouble to check its real progress toward a prosperous life.

The President put it this way at a recent news conference: "A number of my business friends have said their budgets had gone up through these past years from the average 6 to 8, 10 percent a year. And they were astonished that the Federal Government had gone up only 3½ percent, in view of the increased cost in the costly things we have to buy. . . ."

Another view of the big Federal budget was mentioned by President Eisenhower at this same news conference. This is the view that takes the national income as a rough measure of the country's ability to afford Government spending on defense and other programs.

What you see from this angle is that, in the year starting July 1, 1957, Government will spend an amount equal to 20 percent of the Nation's income.

This is about on a line with the proportion of income that Government has been spending during the last several years. Even in 1950, when the United States had shrunk its defenses to something like skeletons, Government was spending about 18 percent of national income.

Now, by contrast, Government is on a virtual war footing. Result: Spending on national security and on all of Government's relations with other nations next year will take about 12.5 percent of the Nation's income. Back in 1950, these things took only 8 percent of income.

Spending on other programs—all the regular peacetime functions of Government—has been climbing steadily these past few years. But national income has been rising, too. Result: Spending on these normal programs next year will take about 7.5 percent of national income. But in 1950, these activities took 10 percent of the Nation's income. In 1939, they took 11 percent of income.

President Eisenhower, referring to these trends, has noted that, while a rise in national income may mean the country can afford more Government spending, it does not mean that Government should necessarily do more. He sums things up in this way: "Explain it as you will, as I said when I first mentioned this budget \$72 billion is still a terrific amount of money to extract from the economy, and put into purposes that are not productive of new machines or new jobs—of new facilities that make new jobs, and everybody is absolutely correct in trying to find the way that those expenses can be cut."

The President warned, however, that the budget could not be reduced substantially unless Congress cuts back on existing programs, many of which were authorized years ago.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to call attention particularly to a brief excerpt from the article:

When you take out of the usual budget picture the effects of inflation, you find this:

Government spending, in terms of "real" dollars of equal buying power—

Let me say, parenthetically, that reference is made to what we might call "constant" dollars—

has been unusually stable for several years.

While spending of these "real" dollars will rise in the year that starts July 1, this spending will remain below the level of 4 years ago—President Eisenhower's first full year in office.

Spending of "ordinary" dollars of today will be up, numerically, next year to a level nearly double that of 1947. Yet "real" spending—or purchasing—will be only about a third larger than in 1947.

Since 1940, the rise in annual budget outlays has been a spectacular \$62.7 billion. Yet only \$21.5 billion of this—or about one-third—is "real" in terms of what Government has been able to buy. About \$41.2 billion—or two-thirds of the rise—is money that is going down the inflation drain.

That is going down the inflation rat-hole, Mr. President, and I charge the responsibility of that to the administrations which preceded the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator has made quite an interesting point, which has perhaps been somewhat confused in the press. Does the Senator from Connecticut feel that the people of the country should consider the increase in the cost of living, on the basis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, or other figures, preceding January 1953 as vastly more alarming and a greater threat to their permanent standard of living than the increases since January 1953?

In other words, is it not a fact that in recent years there has been a small percentage of increase—I believe it is under 4 percent—although it is shown as a constantly rising figure, and in spite of the fact that it is constantly charged that the standard of living has gone up tremendously; whereas the cost of living has been going up only fractionally in recent years as compared with the drastic increases, on which the present increases are based, which took place before January 1953?

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for calling attention to that fact. It is true that when the Eisenhower administration came into office one of the first actions it took was to try to build up defenses against inflation, in order to stop this quiet stealing of the savings of a lifetime that belong to the citizens and taxpayers of our country, and to try to stop the wastage of their pensions and insurance policies and their investments, and so forth, which were being ravaged by this constant depreciation in the value of the dollar.

It is greatly to the credit of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party, which stood solidly on the platform of stopping inflation, that to

a large extent that has been done with in the last 4 years.

The Senator from New York has pointed out that the total increase in the cost of living in the last 4 years and 3 months is less than 4 percent. It will be seen from the figures I have quoted and from others that I shall quote later how that compares with prior years.

It has been the policy of the Eisenhower administration to stop inflation. Our friends across the aisle frequently talk about what they call the hard-money policy of this administration. This administration has no hard-money policy. There is no tight-money policy of this administration. The policy of the administration is to stop inflation.

Fortunately, the Federal Reserve Board has recognized the importance of that policy and has taken such steps as lie within its powers over money markets to stop inflation.

This action has been interpreted politically as a so-called hard-money policy of the Eisenhower administration. It is not that at all. It is important to draw that distinction, and to keep on drawing that distinction.

I notice that the Committee on Finance, under the very able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], is about to hold some hearings on the question of interest rates. That subject will involve this whole question we are discussing. The committee will examine into the debt-management policies of the administration and related subjects.

I am very glad that the committee will do that, and I am sure that if it will—as I know it will, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Virginia—give the Federal Reserve Board a full opportunity to lay before the committee the actions which the Board has taken and the reasons for such actions, the country will feel very secure in the management of our fiscal affairs that lie within the authority of the Federal Reserve Board.

I am very glad that the Senator from New York has raised this question. I hope that as we get into this debate on the budget, and as we get into the question of interest rates, we shall have an opportunity to make clear to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the United States that, so far as the Eisenhower administration is concerned, there has been no hard-money policy, and that there will not be any hard-money policy. The policy is to stop inflation, so as to protect the savings and wages and earnings and insurance policies of the people of the United States, because they are entitled to that protection. It is the only honest way of dealing with fiscal matters affecting the United States Government.

I repeat, I am very grateful to the Senator from New York for raising this point. I wish to quote again from the U. S. News & World Report article, because I believe this point needs emphasis and has a very distinct bearing on the question of the budget.

The article reads, in part, as follows:

Everything Government buys—or nearly everything—has gone up in price in the same way.

For an example of what has happened since a 1940 dollar bought a dollar's worth of goods or labor, look at what has befallen the Armed Forces.

In the days before World War II, the average member of the forces received pay and allowance amounting to \$1,289 a year. Now, that average is budgeted at \$3,767—nearly three times what it was in that earlier day.

Back in 1939, the United States was buying its best fighter planes for \$60,000 apiece. Now, Government is budgeted to pay \$1.5 billion for each fighter plane.

It should be remembered, also, that today's plane is a jet plane.

I continue to quote:

Where a heavy bomber cost \$300,000 in 1939, Government now is paying \$8 million for a single bomber.

These, of course, are not the same planes that Government was buying in 1939. They are bigger, faster, far more complicated, and loaded with expensive gear. Atomic weapons, electronic equipment, other things needed to fight a modern war also take more time and labor to produce than did the fighting gear of 1939.

Therefore, Mr. President, we can see what the forces of inflation and technology have done to the military budget. They have presented a tremendous problem to the Federal Government.

The forces of inflation are one of the chief reasons, if not the chief reason and the most important reason, that we are faced today with a budget which is the highest expenditure budget of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, on this point also I wish to quote an article which recently appeared in the Washington Evening Star. It is by David Lawrence, who, in part, writes:

The critics who have jumped on President Eisenhower for the size of the current budget have ignored the steadily rising costs that have come as a consequence of labor demands each year, and the price increases all along the line that have been required to meet such rises in cost.

Mr. President, the entire editorial has such a bearing on the question that I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed at this point in my remarks, together with certain tables which provide valuable facts relevant to discussion of the budget.

There being no objection, the editorial and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**INFLATION AND UNITED STATES BUDGET—SURVEY SHOWS REQUESTS ACTUALLY BELOW AVERAGE OF PAST 6 YEARS**

(By David Lawrence)

A big surprise is in store for those critics who have been glibly blaming President Eisenhower for the size of the Federal budget.

For it turns out that \$41.2 billion out of the \$62.7 billion by which the budget has been increased since 1940 are the result of rising costs—usually called inflation.

Another way to express it is to say that the Federal Government is today spending \$41.2 billion in higher prices for the same kind of goods and services it bought in 1940 at lower prices.

Actually the Eisenhower budget in terms of a stable dollar is below the level of 4 years ago and less than the average for the last 6 years.

The economic division of the magazine U. S. News & World Report, in a copyrighted article this week, has computed what all the Federal budgets for the last 6 years would

be in 1940 dollars. These economists find that instead of a \$72 billion budget, numerically speaking, the Federal budget on a purchasing-power basis in the coming fiscal year would amount to only \$30.6 billion. This calculation was made in the customary way, familiar to statisticians, by using the Commerce Department's own published index of the prices the Government has paid over the years for the goods it has bought.

The latest budget, moreover, is lower than the last two budgets of the Truman administration, measured the same way, and lower than the one for the first full fiscal year—1954—in which the Eisenhower administration was responsible for the making of the Federal budget.

Turning to the family budget of the average American—and using the Government's price index for the goods the private citizen buys—the same trend is noted. A house that used to sell for \$10,000 just after World War II, sells for \$14,000 today. An automobile that the family bought for \$1,950 in the year 1940, now costs about \$2,800. According to Government figures, the average family in 1940 spent \$2,009 for food, clothing, housing, and all the things that a typical home requires. But by 1947, the outlay was \$4,042, or more than double that of 1940. Looking at a comparison covering the last 10 years, it will be found that the same family is now spending \$5,551, or 40 percent more than in 1947 for the same things. But in terms of 1940 dollars the spending has risen only about 4 percent—from \$2,659 to \$2,766 in the last decade.

The critics who have jumped on President Eisenhower for the size of the current budget have ignored the steadily rising costs that have come as a consequence of labor demands each year and the price increases all along the line that have been required to meet such rises in cost.

Bernard M. Baruch, America's elder statesman, who has had long experience with the inflation problem, made a significant speech 3 years ago on this very question. He said flatly that failure to impose controls promptly by President Roosevelt when World War II occurred, and the unwillingness of President Truman to do likewise soon enough when the Korean war broke out, have placed on the American people a burden of \$140 billion of unnecessary debt—more than half of the total national debt of today.

Mr. Baruch's point is that pressures by different groups of economic and political forces which prevent the opportune ordering of controls over wages and prices is much more expensive in the long run than the inconveniences to the economic system resulting immediately from such controls. For prices and wage scales that once go up cannot be readily rolled back.

Inflation, of course, works both ways. It sends income up, too. That's why there is a big surprise when the total spending of today is related to the national income of the American people. Thus, even in 1957 dollars, the spending by the Federal Government for all nondefense items, including welfare programs, now takes only 7.5 percent of the national income, whereas in 1950 it took 10 percent. Back in 1939, the nondefense category of spending was absorbing 11 percent of the national income. Yet, the erroneous impression now is widespread that nondefense spending today is out of all proportion compared to the past.

Mr. Eisenhower has not yet gone to the people, as he may do soon, with an explanation of what really has caused us to have a \$72 billion budget. When he does, he can show that inflation and postwar exploitation by economic groups are together responsible for the swollen budgets of the National Government, and the State and city governments, as well as the expanded budget of the American family.

*Budget expenditures as percentage of national income (fiscal years)*

Fiscal years	(1) National income (billions)	(2) Budget expenditures (billions)	(3) Percentage (2) = (1)
1939.....	\$70.2	\$8.9	13(12.7)
1945.....	186.5	98.4	53(52.8)
1953.....	300.5	74.3	25(24.7)
1954.....	298.2	67.8	23(22.7)
1955.....	308.6	64.6	21(20.9)
1956.....	334.1	66.5	20(19.9)
1957 estimate.....	{ 336.3-353.3 (350)	68.9	20(19.7)
1958 estimate.....	{ 350.4-368.2 (363)	71.8	20(19.8)

*Budget expenditures as a percent of gross national product, fiscal years of 1956-58*

	Gross national product (billions)	Federal budget expenditures (billions)	Budget expenditures as a percent of gross national product
Fiscal year 1956 (actual).....	\$402.6	\$66.5	16.5(2)
Fiscal year 1957: 1st quarter (actual).....	413.8	-----	-----
2d quarter (actual).....	423.8	-----	-----
3d quarter (preliminary comm., CEA).....	426.5	-----	-----
4th quarter projection.....	430.0	-----	-----
Average for year.....	423.5	68.9	16.3(27)
Fiscal year 1958, consistent with revenue projection and above 1957 quarters (no price rise): 1st quarter.....	434-35	-----	-----
2d quarter.....	438-40	-----	-----
3d quarter.....	442-45	-----	-----
4th quarter.....	446-50	-----	-----
Average for year.....	440-442.5	71.8	16.3(2)-16.2(3)

*Budget expenditures per capita in actual and constant prices (fiscal years)*

Fiscal year	Actual prices	Constant prices <sup>1</sup>
1939.....	\$68	\$157
1945.....	707	1,204
1953.....	469	494
1954.....	421	442
1955.....	394	415
1956.....	399	413
1957 estimate.....	406	408
1958 estimate.....	416	416

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted to December 1956 wholesale prices.

**BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND AVERAGE WAGES IN THE ECONOMY**

1. The monthly data on labor's earnings published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the period July 1953 through June 1954 show that for the fiscal year ending June 1954, for production workers in manufacturing, the average hourly earnings were \$1.79; weekly earnings were \$71.27.

2. For December 1956, for the same groups of workers, the average hourly earnings were \$2.05; weekly earnings were \$84.05.

3. Thus, the percentage increase from the fiscal year 1954 to December 1956 is 14.5 percent for average hourly earnings; 17.9 percent for average weekly earnings.

4. The increase in budget expenditures is less than these percentages. Estimated fiscal year 1957 expenditures of \$68,900 million are 1.7 percent above fiscal year 1954 expenditures of \$67,772 million. Fiscal year



1958 expenditures are estimated at \$71,807 million; 6 percent above fiscal year 1954.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to say one more word about those who are attacking the administration on the basis of the so-called hard-money policy and the question of interest rates. I feel that what they are really doing—and perhaps they do not realize it—is to attack absolutely the integrity of the Federal Reserve System, which is a great bulwark of defense in our whole economy, and is a great credit to the Democratic Party, under whose auspices it came into being.

I hope that in the course of the coming debate about interest rates, we can make the people of the country understand that the past attempts to make money cheap artificially resulted only in rapidly increasing the cost of living. This has had a very deleterious effect upon the savings of the people and also upon the budget submitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield briefly, for a question.

Mr. GORE. What does the Senator mean by artificially increasing or decreasing interest rates?

Mr. BUSH. I mean by that the fixing by law of interest rates at a low figure, a figure which is below the normal market, below the market created for money by supply and demand, such as the fixing of an interest rate of 4½ percent on VA loans. Such a rate, at a time when demand for credit is very large, makes those loans unattractive to the investors of the country. The consequence is a shortage of supply of money for those purposes.

I consider that the artificial fixing of interest rates, as, for instance, was done in the previous administration, when Treasury bonds were pegged at par, resulted in the establishing of an artificial price level for those bonds.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from Connecticut agree that since the country is no longer on a gold standard, the currency is a managed currency?

Mr. BUSH. I agree with that statement. Yes; that is correct. We are not entirely off the gold standard. We are so far as the convertibility of the currency is concerned.

Mr. GORE. Then would not the Senator agree that a calculated action or policy deliberately adopted by the Government to push interest rates up or to push interest rate down could equally be described as artificial?

Mr. BUSH. No.

Mr. GORE. In other words, would the Senator say that anything which tended to push interest rates down would be artificial; but if interest rates went up, that was according to the law of supply and demand?

Mr. BUSH. No. I think the Senator from Tennessee realizes that the power lies within the Federal Reserve Board to make certain impressions upon the money market which may have the ef-

fect of loosening it or tightening it. Inasmuch as we do not have the control that is provided by convertibility into gold, it is necessary, therefore, that there be some other control. It is very necessary that that other control not be interfered with for political purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Which action by the Federal Reserve or the Treasury, the action to loosen or the action to tighten—to use the Senator's own terms—the availability of credit, would he describe as an artificial action?

Mr. BUSH. I do not intend to discuss the whole subject of interest rates today. I brought it into my own remarks parenthetically this afternoon. I certainly intend to make my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee, very well aware of my views in connection with the matter when I appear before the committee of which he is a member and also on the floor of the Senate, if the matter comes before the Senate. I do not wish to labor this particular argument about the budget with that side issue. So if the Senator will permit me, I shall not go into a detailed answer of his question, which I think is a perfectly fair question, but I shall answer it for him at another time.

Mr. President, I do not contend that the budget cannot and should not be reduced. I believe it is possible to achieve sound economies which will pave the way for tax cuts. But this work requires the careful use of a surgeon's scalpel, instead of a butcher's meat ax.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a recent letter sent by President Eisenhower to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, in which the President pointed to a way in which an economy operation can be performed on the Federal budget without hamstringing the programs which the people have endorsed, and to which we are pledged.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from the President to Speaker RAYBURN.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, April 18, 1957.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am sure many Members of the Congress are as gratified as I am to note the growing awareness of private citizens that the dollars spent by the Federal Government are in fact their own dollars, and that Federal benefits are not free but must be paid for out of taxes collected from the people. It is good to see this realization developing into a widespread insistence that Federal activity be held to the minimum consistent with national needs. As this sentiment grows, our country will be strengthened in many ways.

The evident responsiveness of the Congress to this attitude I find equally encouraging. I assure you and your colleagues that the executive branch will continue to cooperate fully with Members of the Congress who work for sensible control of Federal spending.

In House Resolution 190 adopted last March, I noted the assertion that the public

interest requires a "substantial reduction" in the 1958 budget and also the request that I advise the House where a reduction of that magnitude could best be made.

You will recall that last January, immediately after the budget was presented to the Congress, I requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to resurvey the expenditures of every department and agency in an effort to find additional items that could properly be reduced. I have kept in close touch with those efforts. Some of the principal results are outlined in this letter.

You realize, of course, that the 1958 budget, as all Federal budgets, is in effect 2 budgets within 1. One consists of requests for new spending authority to enable Federal agencies to obligate themselves to make expenditures sometime in the future. The other concerns the actual expenditures of the agencies in the next fiscal year.

These expenditures will be made partly pursuant to spending authority granted in previous years and partly under new spending authority. For example, one-third of the total actual expenditures in the 1958 fiscal year will be made pursuant to spending authority granted not on the basis of the 1958 budget but on the basis of spending authority requested in earlier budgets. This problem I emphasize because of its importance in appraising the effect of cuts in new spending authority which, one might assume, will reduce the level of current spending but in fact may affect only future spending.

The House resolution, for instance, does not distinguish between these two budgetary problems, so its call for a "substantial reduction," I assume, applies to both and contemplates the reduction of both by a considerable number of billions of dollars.

There are thousands of items in the budget, each an individual fiscal plan to carry forward a new program or a program previously authorized by the Congress. The preparation of these items begins long before the Congress acts, with the result that the budgetary process places a high premium on judgment and foresight. Because departmental needs must be forecast a year or more in advance, no responsible official would realistically contend that every estimate for every item is precisely correct and could be changed only at the risk of serious public injury, or that the funds requested are certain to meet all future needs.

Nevertheless, painstaking efforts were made in preparing the budget to pare to the minimum all projected expenditures and programs, whether large or small. Estimates were substantially reduced before the budget document was submitted to the Congress, and at my request a searching reexamination by all departments and agencies has continued to go forward since that time in an effort to reduce expenditures whenever possible. I will later discuss possible reductions in new spending authority disclosed by these months of continuing review.

Before turning to budgetary specifics, however, I invite attention to certain general guidelines that, to the extent existing law permitted, were applied in formulating the 1958 budget. These may be helpful to the House in reaching its own budgetary decisions:

First, the Federal Government should undertake only essential activities that the people cannot sufficiently provide for themselves or obtain adequately through private voluntary action or local or State government. Both the Congress and the executive branch should adhere closely to this principle in the interest of sound, economical government.

Second, in times like these Government spending should be held below income in order to lead the way to further reductions in taxes and the public debt.

Third, all governmental expenditures should remain under close scrutiny in the

interest of strict economy and, in the currently prevailing prosperity, to help relieve competing demands for economic resources.

Such guidelines have proved their practical worth. Today Federal civilian employees are almost a quarter of a million fewer than in January 1953. The \$7.4 billion tax cut in 1954 has already saved our people almost \$25 billion in taxes. For the first time in a quarter of a century we have in prospect three balanced budgets in a row. In fiscal year 1956 the surplus was \$1.6 billion. It promises this fiscal year to be about the same size, and next year perhaps as much as \$1.8 billion. If we hold to this course, we should have paid in these 3 years about \$5 billion on the public debt, and the annual necessity to raise the statutory debt limit should have become a thing of the past.

By adhering to the same or similar guidelines, the House can help continue the progress already made.

Regarding the House appeal for guidance on specific budgetary items, I will comment first on the actual expenditures projected for next fiscal year and will later discuss possible reductions in new spending authority.

At the outset, we need to remind ourselves that, as in every household budget, all Federal expenditures are not equally subject to control. Many Federal expenditures are rigidly prescribed by law. Others are bills that simply have to be paid. In the 1958 fiscal year such unavoidable expenditures will total about \$17.6 billion, or 24 percent of all Federal expenditures. These funds must be spent for such items as veterans' pensions, public assistance, and the interest on the public debt. The substantial reduction called for by House Resolution 190 cannot be made in this part of the budget until and unless the Congress revises or repeals the governing laws.

In the second place, 63 percent of projected expenditures next fiscal year—some \$45 billion—will support programs related to the protection of our country. Departmental estimates in this area were most carefully examined and prudently reduced before they were sent to the Congress. I foresee no early lessening of international tensions and dangers as would justify a significant downward revision in our defense and related programs. The fact is, as we carry forward our efforts for more peaceful world conditions, rapid technological advances in ships, aircraft, nuclear weapons, missiles, and electronics press constantly for more, not fewer, Federal dollars. I most solemnly advise the House that in these times a cut of any appreciable consequence in current expenditures for national security and related programs would endanger our country and the peace of the world.

The remaining expenditures projected in the budget approximate \$9 billion, 13 percent of the total. These support the rest of the Federal Government—such activities as public health, the various housing programs, all operations of most executive departments, the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, the nationwide functions of the General Services Administration, the worldwide operations of the Department of State. Additional savings in such widely varied activities may well be found by the executive branch and the Congress. But a multi-billion-dollar reduction as evidently envisaged by the House resolution would destroy or cripple many essential programs if concentrated in this limited area of the budget.

Thus, it is clear that a "substantial reduction" in Federal expenditures next fiscal year in keeping with House Resolution 190, whether in any one or a combination of these major segments of the budget, would weaken the Nation's defenses, or cut back or eliminate programs now required by law or proposed in the public interest, or both. That forces the conclusion that a multi-billion-dollar reduction in 1958 expenditures

can be accomplished only at the expense of the national safety and interest.

Turning now to requests for new spending authority, as distinguished from actual expenditures, we find a more promising outlook. Budgetary reviews since last January have disclosed the feasibility of postponing certain of these requests without serious damage to program levels. A number of the following actions, which I commend to the House, I have already suggested:

First, that new spending authority for the military assistance portion of the mutual security program be reduced by \$500 million. This reduction results mainly from the new management techniques through which lead-time financing has been reduced (notably for spare parts), maintenance support not justified by the rate of consumption of our allies has been eliminated, and items have been removed from grant aid which countries can now pay for themselves. If the funds previously appropriated are continued available, this reduction will not impair the operation of military forces of other countries at mutually agreed levels.

Second, that, by delaying less urgent projects, new spending authority for military public works be reduced by \$200 million.

Third, that, resulting from new projections of its operating rate and related financial requirements, the new spending authority for the soil-bank program be reduced by \$254 million.

Fourth, that the investment of the Federal National Mortgage Association in special assistance functions be reduced from \$250 million to \$200 million, a reduction in new spending authority of \$50 million.

Fifth, that the college housing authorization be reduced from \$175 million to \$150 million, a reduction in new spending authority of \$25 million.

Sixth, that resulting from adjustments of construction schedules, the new spending authority of the Corps of Engineers be reduced by \$13 million.

The House may wish to give attention to an additional item of \$516 million requested for Army procurement and production. The existing authority, granted by the Congress during the Korean war, plus certain reimbursements received since then have made it unnecessary to request new spending authority for this purpose in recent years. Beginning in fiscal year 1959, the Army's need for such spending authority will recur. The \$516 million item is requested now to enable the Army to phase efficiently into this new period and to ease the impact of this adjustment in fiscal year 1959. At the expense of efficient programing, the sum can be withheld if the House so chooses. Such action would, of course, increase by \$516 million the large amount that will have to be authorized for Army procurement and production in fiscal year 1959.

Exclusive of the Army item just mentioned but including a possible reduction of \$300 million in the amount budgeted for contingent expenses, these reductions and postponements total \$1,342 billion. Once again I remind the House that less than half of this reduction in new spending authority can be reflected in reductions in expenditures during the next fiscal year, and even a part of these expenditure reductions will have to be restored in the future. Such expenditure reductions as may result, however, will add to the \$1.8 billion surplus already projected by the budget. Given continuation of healthy economic growth and of strict expenditure control, these figures combined will begin to lay a firm fiscal foundation for the time when we can be sufficiently assured that our income will so exceed our expenses as to justify a reasonable tax cut for every taxpayer while we continue to reduce the Government's debt.

I am, of course, aware of the cuts thus far proposed by the House. These will be absorbed wherever possible without serious in-

jury to programs essential to the public interest. Where such cuts cannot be so absorbed, the executive branch must and will seek restoration of the needed funds. Some of the House "cuts" have involved large sums that the executive branch is compelled by law to pay. "Cuts" of that kind do not save money and must be later restored through supplemental appropriations unless the governing statutes are revised.

Aside from scrutinizing individual expenditures and reducing new spending authority as suggested above, I strongly urge the House also to improve the Federal budgetary situation by taking such steps as these, most of which I have urged before:

First, adjust postal rates as soon as possible to reduce and eventually eliminate the postal deficit.

Second, establish interest rates for Government loan programs that will induce private funds to participate in their financing and, at the least, require that such rates cover the borrowing costs of the Federal Government.

Third, provide user charges as, for instance, for the use of Federal airway facilities, that will relieve the general public of having to subsidize governmental services affording special benefits.

Fourth, require State financial participation in Federal disaster assistance programs.

Fifth, encourage State and local groups to engage in partnership with the Federal Government in major water-resources development.

Sixth, reject new projects not approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and not reviewed by all interested parties, including the affected States; provide where appropriate for more local participation in approved projects; and withhold authorization and construction of all but urgently needed projects.

Seventh, enact bills approved by the administration to implement Hoover Commission recommendations, such as the authorization of appropriations on the basis of annual accrued expenditures and the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Eighth, establish procedures that will facilitate the return of surplus Federal land and other property to private, local, or State use.

Ninth, before adopting unbudgeted programs, project the costs they would impose on the Federal budget in years ahead, and reappraise the necessity for and rate of implementation of each program.

And, 10th, to help assure continuing economy on the part of the Congress as well as the executive branch, take action that will grant the President the power now held by many State governors to veto specific items in appropriations bills.

An improved budgetary situation and greater efficiency in our Government will result from prompt approval of these recommendations by the Congress. All elements of the budget, meanwhile, will remain under searching examination by the executive branch in its continuing effort to find additional savings, large or small, that are possible under existing law. Any additional reductions found possible in new spending authority will be promptly reported in the usual way to the Senate and House of Representatives.

Finally, I repeat that as this effort to hold Federal costs and activities to the minimum proceeds sensibly in the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government, the public interest is bound to be well served.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to quote, for emphasis only, a brief portion of the letter, as follows:

I invite attention to certain general guidelines that, to the extent existing law permitted, were applied in formulating the 1958



budget. These may be helpful to the House in reaching its own budgetary decisions:

First, the Federal Government should undertake only essential activities that the people cannot sufficiently provide for themselves or obtain adequately through private voluntary action or local or State government. Both the Congress and the executive branch should adhere closely to this principle in the interest of sound, economical Government.

Second, in times like these Government spending should be held below income in order to lead the way to further reductions in taxes and the public debt.

Third, all governmental expenditures should remain under close scrutiny in the interest of strict economy and, in the currently prevailing prosperity, to help relieve competing demands for economic resources.

Such guidelines have proved their practical worth. Today—

And this is interesting, because one does not hear it commented on very often in the budget discussion—

Today Federal civilian employees are almost a quarter of a million fewer than in January 1953. The \$7.4 billion tax cut in 1954 has already saved our people almost \$25 billion in taxes. For the first time in a quarter of a century we have in prospect three balanced budgets in a row. In fiscal year 1956 the surplus was \$1.6 billion. It promises this fiscal year to be about the same size, and next year perhaps as much as \$1.8 billion. If we hold to this course, we should have paid in these 3 years about \$5 billion on the public debt, and the annual necessity to raise the statutory debt limit should have become a thing of the past.

Mr. President, I quote now from another part of the President's letter:

At the outset, we need to remind ourselves that, as in every household budget, all Federal expenditures are not equally subject to control. Many Federal expenditures are rigidly prescribed by law. Others are bills that simply have to be paid. In the 1958 fiscal year such unavoidable expenditures will total about \$17.6 billion, or 24 percent of all Federal expenditures. These funds must be spent for such items as veterans' pensions, public assistance, and the interest on the public debt. The substantial reduction called for by House Resolution 190 cannot be made in this part of the budget until and unless the Congress revises or repeals the governing laws.

In the second place, 63 percent of projected expenditures next fiscal year—some \$45 billion—will support programs related to the protection of our country.

I skip to other paragraphs in the President's letter:

The remaining expenditures projected in the budget approximate \$9 billion, 13 percent of the total. These support the rest of the Federal Government—such activities as public health, the various housing programs, all operations of most executive departments, the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, the nationwide functions of the General Services Administration, the worldwide operations of the Department of State.

Additional savings in such widely varied activities may well be found by the executive branch and the Congress. But a multi-billion-dollar reduction as evidently envisaged by the House resolution would destroy or cripple many essential programs if concentrated in this limited area of the budget.

Thus, it is clear that a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures next fiscal year in keeping with House Resolution 190, whether in any one or a combination of these

major segments of the budget, would weaken the Nation's defenses, or cut back or eliminate programs now required by law or proposed in the public interest, or both. That forces the conclusion that a multi-billion-dollar reduction in 1958 expenditures can be accomplished only at the expense of the national safety and interest.

Mr. President, in considering those programs, let me refer for a moment to the housing program. We have concluded our committee hearings on that program, and we are now in the process of drafting a housing bill for this year. Let me point out that I observe on the part of the Democratic members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, tendencies not to cut the President's budget, but, instead, to very substantially increase it. I am very much in sympathy with such programs as the urban redevelopment program and the slum clearance program. These programs, as provided in the 1954 act, have been of substantial benefit and will be of substantial benefit to many communities in Connecticut and to all our industrialized centers. In his budget the President has made adequate provision for them, I believe. However, I do not wish to see the President's budget cut, insofar as these programs, which we are just getting under way, are concerned. I think the advocates of economy should be consistent, at least to the extent of not trying to persuade us to increase the appropriations for these items, which, according to the agency, are sufficient to keep the program going at a reasonably good pace.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to my Republican colleagues. President Eisenhower's overwhelming victory last year was more than a personal tribute to a great and beloved leader; it was an expression of confidence on the part of the people in the Eisenhower programs which were unanimously endorsed in the platform adopted by the Republican National Convention in California, in August 1956. I remind my Republican colleagues that the President's budget is intended to provide the funds necessary to carry out those pledges, which were made to the American people.

We are pledged to the maintenance of a strong national defense, to advancement of the cause of peace in the world, and to domestic programs which are responsive to human needs and which provide essential services in a growing national economy. The President has said that he does not intend to run away from his promises, now that the American economy is bulging at the seams, and when employment is at very high levels, and when the gross national product reached a new high in 1956, and is headed for another new high in 1957. We are not going to run away from our pledges to the people. All these economic conditions, in a general way, are helpful in connection with the Government's programs which are included in the budget. We are pledged, I have said, to the maintenance of a strong national defense and the advancement of the cause of peace in the world—so ably discussed today by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]—and to domestic pro-

grams which are responsive to human needs, and which provide essential services in a growing national economy.

I should like briefly to quote from the Republican platform, because I think it has a very definite bearing on the question of the budget. We said, in that platform:

Four thousand communities, studying their school populations and their physical and financial resources, encourage our Republican administration to urge a 5-year program of Federal assistance in building schools to relieve a critical classroom shortage.

The Republican Party will renew its efforts to enact a program based on sound principles of need and designed to encourage increased State and local efforts to build more classrooms.

We also said:

We have supported measures that have made more housing available than ever before in history, reduced urban slums in local-Federal partnership, stimulated record home ownership, and authorized additional low-rent public housing.

We also said:

We initiated the first flood-insurance program in history under Government sponsorship in cooperation with private enterprise.

Mr. President, I should like to say, parenthetically, that I hope the House of Representatives will vote for the necessary appropriation to put the flood-insurance program into effect. I cannot possibly understand the delay which has occurred in the House of Representatives in the case of the appropriation to implement this program, which was voted by substantial majorities in both Houses last year, with virtually no opposition at all. I hope the House of Representatives will soon vote for the necessary appropriation to get the program under way.

We also said:

We pledge close cooperation with State, local, and private agencies to reduce the ghastly toll of fatalities on the Nation's highways.

Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is not on the floor at the moment, since he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, and I have worked very closely with him during the last 2 or 3 years in connection with highway legislation. But, Mr. President, I say to all my colleagues in the Senate that this is no time to abandon such a program as that for the National System of Interstate Highways. This is a time when that program should be pushed toward completion. The revenues for the program are provided especially by the gasoline tax and other highway user taxes, and are set aside in a trust fund; and I believe it would be a tragedy if the law were changed so as to require that those funds go back into the general fund of the Treasury. We need the National System of Interstate Highways; we need it for many reasons—for national defense, for improved travel for commerce, for improved travel for pleasure, and for the safety of the lives of the American families who travel on our highways. We have only to consider the mounting toll, year by year, in the case of deaths and accidents of all kinds upon our highways,

to appreciate the need for the system of interstate highways, which is financed approximately 90 percent by Federal Government funds, taken out of the increased funds coming from highway user taxes—increased funds which come largely as a result of the increased use of the highways provided under the act.

Mr. President, those who are so anxious to help us reduce the budget should also consider most seriously the situation in the Post Office Department. I see on the floor at this time the distinguished senior Republican member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I hope we shall hear from him on this subject. I believe it is vital that those who are sincerely interested in the budget get behind a postal-rate increase, which is long, long overdue; it has been 25 years since there has been an increase in the first-class mail rate.

Despite the improvements which have been made in the postal system, under the leadership of Postmaster General Summerfield—and a great many improvements have been made—the postal system is still in need of a great deal of renovation and a great deal of improvement. That will never be done, in my opinion, Mr. President, unless we get the postal service on a self-sustaining or nearly self-sustaining basis. Therefore, I hope the Congress will act favorably on the recommendation of the President of the United States that the postal rates be increased.

In our platform, we said this about that subject:

We pledge to continue our efforts, blocked by the Democratic leadership of the 84th Congress, for a financially sound, more nearly self-sustaining postal service—with the users of the mails paying a greater share of the costs instead of the taxpayers bearing the burden of huge postal deficits.

Mr. President, I go to another subject. We stated in our platform the following, and this was dealt with by the distinguished Senator from New York very ably:

We recognize that no single nation can alone defend the liberty of all nations threatened by Communist aggression or subversion. Mutual security means effective mutual cooperation. Poverty and unrest in less developed countries make them the target for international communism. We must help them achieve the economic growth and stability necessary to attain and preserve their independence.

Technical and economic assistance programs are effective countermeasures to Soviet economic offensives and propaganda. They provide the best way to create the political and social stability essential to lasting peace.

We will strive to bring about conditions that will end the injustices of nations divided against their will, of nations held subject to foreign domination, of peoples deprived of the right of self-government.

To that end, Mr. President, I feel that we are committed to support the budget of the President in connection with the matters heretofore mentioned. I feel we have an obligation, because of the pledges of the Republican Party platform; and I have read some of the pledges that were made when we asked the American

people to reelect Dwight D. Eisenhower President of the United States and entrust the conduct of our National Government to a Republican Party administration.

I remind some of my colleagues that reckless talk of budget cuts as deep as \$3 billion or \$4 billion or \$5 billion will create the impression that Republicans are turning their backs on their pledges.

I know the President has no intention of repudiating his promises, and the Republican Party should not permit the people even to suspect that we are less faithful to our trust than he is.

Let us remember that we are a party of principle. Let us approach the job of cutting the budget in that frame of mind.

There can be reductions in the budget. Actions can be taken in this Congress which will pave the way for tax cuts in the future. But budget cutting must be undertaken on a carefully selective basis, without injuring our national defense, without undermining our leadership in the free world, and without impairing the essential services which the people need.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to say I always think it is unfortunate that we never seem to have a chance to come to grips with the budget as a budget. We try to handle the budget through separate appropriation bills. To my knowledge, efforts have been made by leaders in the Senate, since I have been a Member of the Senate, to bring about a single appropriation bill, so that, after all is said and done, we can look at the whole thing at once and say, "Now, is this what we really want or not?" The way we are compelled to vote upon appropriations now, piecemeal, having 12 separate appropriation bills, it is virtually impossible for a Senator, who may wish to be economy minded and who may wish to help in a reduction of the budget, to know where he stands in relationship to the whole matter. So I once more express enthusiastic approval of a single appropriation bill.

Also, I take this opportunity to say I wish we could pass an item-veto bill, so the President of the United States could veto certain items which creep into appropriation bills, without having to veto the whole bill. I think most of the States permit their governors to exercise an item-veto privilege. In the interest of economy, it seems to me we could hardly pass a bill which would be more useful than an item-veto bill, by which the President of the United States could exercise some discretion in connection with a veto.

Last year we passed an omnibus bill, but there were items amounting to six or seven hundred million dollars in that bill, representing a minority of the total, which had not been approved either by the Corps of Engineers or by the Bureau of the Budget, and were not really in good shape to be passed by the Congress; but we passed it.

The President felt compelled to veto the entire measure, because there were certain items in it which had not gone through the normal routine that had been set by the Congress previously for

it to follow. If the President had had the privilege that an item veto bill would give him, and if he had had the responsibility which an item veto bill would give him, he would never have vetoed that omnibus bill, and we would have been in a much better position today to go ahead with some of the flood-protection projects that were included in the bill, and which are of vital necessity to the country, than we find ourselves in today.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, like all other Senators, I am sure, I have been receiving a heavy volume of mail about the President's budget for the coming fiscal year. With a few exceptions, the letters streaming into my office have attacked the size of the budget and have demanded substantial cuts, particularly in programs related to our foreign policies which President Eisenhower has described as essential to our security and our national interests.

Mr. President, it is ironic that the battle against the Eisenhower budget has been originated and led by persons and groups who have always been the hard core of the Republican Party, the President's party. The signal for the attack was given early by the President's own Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George M. Humphrey. The cue was taken at once by groups who share Secretary Humphrey's big-business background and philosophy.

Thus, for instance, a large, expensive advertisement appeared in the Portland Oregonian last month, urging people in Portland to write to their Senators and their Congresswoman—all Democrats—to cut the President's budget. This advertisement was sponsored by a group of Oregon industrial companies, headed by the company whose president is the current president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The advertisement prominently quotes Secretary Humphrey's statement that the President's budget might precipitate a hair-curling depression. Not only does it quote the Secretary of the Treasury against the President's budget, it even seeks to quote the President himself against it. To read this advertisement, you might wonder who prepared this budget and presented it to the Congress in the first place. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the advertisement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SPEAK UP—WRITE NOW—CUT FEDERAL SPENDING—IT'S TIME THE GOVERNMENT STARTED LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS—THE BUDGET MUST (AND CAN) BE TRIMMED—BUT IT'S UP TO YOU**

Most of us live within our income. It's not easy, but we do it. Sometimes we go without things we'd like to have, but we have just so much money and that's that.

But look at the Federal Government.

It charges ahead, taxing and spending almost without restraint. If it needs more money it just puts a bigger bite on the taxpayers. Why, right now Uncle Sam is asking for \$71.8 billion of our money (yours and mine) for 1958.



And, don't let anybody kid you: the sharp rise in Government spending is not due primarily to increased defense costs. The Government is spending less on defense than it did in 1954. The increase in Government spending comes from special programs and pet projects not concerned with defense.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, says that the proposed budget can be cut at least \$5 billion without hurting national defense or the efficiency of the Government. Many Congressmen agree. The Hoover Commission has also shown how billions can be saved.

But Government spending goes higher and higher—and when anybody complains about it, Washington blames it on us, the people. Washington says it has to spend all that money because we, the people, demand it.

That's just not true. The demand for these enormous increases in spending does not come from the people. It comes from pressure groups—from organizations that want something for themselves at the expense of the taxpayers.

How long are we going to let pressure groups and bureaucrats dictate how much of our money the Government will tax and spend?

This Government spending spree must be stopped—and there is only one way to stop it: we, the people, must take a stand.

It's up to us. Only we can make Uncle Sam come to his senses and start living within the income we can afford. If all of us don't stand up and speak out for economy, nobody else will.

President Eisenhower has said he hopes Congress will cut the budget wherever it can. Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey warned that unless Federal spending is reduced we'll have a depression that "will curl your hair."

Write your Congressman today. Urge a cut in Federal spending.

Do it now, while Congress is debating the 1958 budget. Let them know how you feel. It's your money they're going to spend. Speak up. Write now. Or be prepared to pay the price.

Write three letters today. Spend 9 cents—help save billions.

#### WHAT THE BUDGET MEANS TO EVERY OREGONIAN

As it stands now, the budget will cost each Oregonian—man, woman, and child—about \$431.

The original budget estimated for 1958 was \$4 billion less than the \$71.8 billion called for by the President. This \$4 billion could have been used to cut taxes—a cut that would have saved each Oregonian about \$24 and the entire State about \$40 million.

The Federal budget affects us all. It affects our homes, our jobs, our savings, our liberty. Let's do something about it. Write now.

Here are the Congressmen to write:  
Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Representative EDITH GREEN, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Sponsored by: The Hyster Co., Electric Steel Foundry Co., Albina Engine & Machine Works, Inc., Cascade Manufacturing Co., Howard-Cooper Corp., and Irvington Machine Works.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one cannot be wholly unsympathetic with the disappointment and chagrin thus expressed about the Eisenhower budget by some people. After all, many of the sentiments set forth in this advertisement could have been taken directly from General Eisenhower's campaign speeches in his first race for the Presidency. As a candidate, the President made extensive use of the familiar arsenal of economy

slogans which for so long had been his party's favorite political ammunition. Of course, that is always politically convenient; but it also means that the President cannot escape his own responsibility for its consequences in the form of the attacks on the Federal budget we see today.

Mr. President, although it might be politically tempting for a Democratic Senator to join in criticism of the budget of a Republican President, I have, by and large, defended the budget against these attacks. I have tried to point out that the budget represents Government programs; that you cannot attack appropriations without destroying the programs themselves. Of course, Mr. President, that is the real target of the attack. The people who have led the fight on the President's budget, as for example in the advertisement I have mentioned, have little sympathy for the Government's social welfare programs, for its agricultural programs, or for our overseas programs of international cooperation. The economy slogan has always served as a convenient guise for crippling attacks on the substance of governmental activities.

The mask slipped a bit, in the case of the sponsors of the advertisement in the Oregonian, when the advertisement explains that the demand for appropriations for governmental programs "does not come from the people. It comes from pressure groups." Mr. President, I suppose it all depends on the program in question. Apparently, men who want fast tax writeoffs for private-utility dams, or subsidies for new merchant ships, or a \$25 billion Federal highway program—they are people. Only pressure groups want higher pay or more adequate retirement benefits for postal and civil-service employees, or Federal aid to school construction, or flood-control and flood-insurance protection for endangered persons and property—from New England to Oregon. And sometimes we are led to believe that no one at all, except possibly some anonymous bureaucrats, wants the Government to continue the mutual security program, the point 4 technical-assistance program, and the other overseas programs of our foreign policy which the President has said are essential in our national interest.

Mr. President, because the advertisement in the Oregonian urged people to write their Senators to cut the President's budget, I wrote an article for the editorial page of the Oregonian to set forth my views on this subject. This article appeared, in slightly abridged form, on April 16, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ARTICLE FOR THE OREGONIAN

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

As a result of advertisements placed in the Oregonian by the Hyster Co. and other corporations, my office is inundated by letters from our State demanding huge cuts in the Federal budget. To a Democrat like me, it is politically tempting to respond to this torrent of mail by blaming the budget on Presi-

dent Eisenhower, who submitted this \$71,-800,000,000 spending program to Congress.

But the path of partisan politics is not always the path of responsibility. The budget is the problem for us all, because it determines the posture of our Government—at home and in the rest of the world.

Contrary to the advertisement, President Eisenhower has not advised the Congress to cut the budget. Indeed, on April 3, the President even defended to the last penny the most controversial item in the budget—over \$4,400,000,000 in so-called foreign aid. He said this "is the program we believe is the least we can do."

As a Member of the United States Senate who must vote on the budget, I would appreciate the opportunity of posing a few questions to those who are insisting that Congress apply a meat ax to the President's budget. These are my inquiries:

1. More than 80 percent of all Federal expenditures are for past and future national security, including the Armed Forces, new weapons, veterans' programs, foreign policy programs, and interest on the national debt. To what extent should Congress pit its judgment against that of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and his other advisers, on matters of national security?

The only part of the budget where cuts could be large enough to affect our taxes one way or another is in the \$43 billion military security appropriations. What would critics of the Congress say if Congress were to cut these appropriations far beyond the level we are told the Nation's safety requires?

2. The most tempting target to most of my correspondents is the budget for our overseas expenditures, generally lumped together under the unpopular label of "foreign aid." The bulk of these expenditures goes for the military needs of South Korea, Formosa, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and other allies of the United States. The valiant and democratic people of Norway and Denmark have just again been threatened with atomic obliteration by Russia because of their participation in NATO, and their fate is at stake in NATO's continued strength. Should we surrender these free people and strategic areas to their powerful Communist neighbors? Or undertake their defense by increasing our own armed strength, even if this means putting twice as many young Americans under arms, just to avoid the unpopular notion of "foreign aid"? Similarly, the far smaller budgeted sums for point 4 technical assistance and economic development are important programs of our foreign policy. Should Congress, in the process of making appropriations, undertake to reverse the Eisenhower administration's foreign policies?

In a number of treaties and other commitments, the American people have pledged their sons to the defense of distant lands. Surely we are not a Nation willing to be internationalist with its soldiers but isolationist with its dollars. As long as we send American troops to remote bases across the seven seas, I shall not vote to deny the President funds for policies which he says will make less likely the danger of atomic combat for these men—and that applies regardless of the political party of the President occupying the White House.

3. The elimination of Federal aid to schools is urged by many of the letters. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has said that some 35,000 essential classrooms can be built each year only through Federal aid. A nationwide survey has just revealed that 75 percent of men schoolteachers and 17 percent of women must take on extra jobs in order to feed themselves and their families. We could, of course, close our eyes to the educational needs of America's children, and let the schools of the world's richest Nation fall behind those of Soviet Russia and other, less

wealthy countries. But if we want the schools we need, they must be paid for from taxes, whether local or Federal—and at this very time, the strains on our local sources of taxation should demonstrate to people in Oregon why the Federal taxing powers are needed to help meet the heavy capital outlay for new school buildings.

4. Health and welfare is another place where budget cutting is demanded. Even the President's budget sliced cancer-research funds by 3 percent—to \$46 million. Yet the retiring Surgeon General of the United States told me the Government might be able to use 10 times this sum in a "crash" program to try to get at the grim riddle of malignant diseases. Is any expenditure too large to invest in an effort to lift from over the heads of every man, woman, and child on earth the terrible sword of Damocles which we know as cancer? Could anyone buy his own cancer research with the pennies he might save by the cut in this appropriation?

5. The advertisement in the Oregonian sought to apply the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to the budget. Some of these recommendations are adverse to the continued operation of the Bonneville Power Administration, and to further Federal dams on the Columbia like McNary, The Dalles, or John Day. They would threaten such navigation benefits as the Yaquina Bay Harbor and the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River, unless so-called user charges are imposed. Surely no one with Oregon's interests at heart desires to see our water-development programs put in such straitjackets.

6. Finally, the administration's tight-money policy, by increasing interest rates on the Federal debt, has itself added to the annual Federal budget almost \$1 billion in interest charges over fiscal 1955—and corresponding increases in State and local debt charges. Local school bonds, for instance, now must carry twice the interest cost of a few years ago. Thus billions in interest charges are added to our tax bills by administration fiscal policies for which we, in effect, receive nothing.

A Federal budget can be considered only in relation to the size of the country financing it. In the past 4 years, the budget actually has declined from 20 percent of the gross national product to 16 percent. I fear that reckless and indiscriminate cuts will be made at the expense of useful programs like aid to schools, health research, and self-liquidating investments such as our Northwest power dams.

This is not to say that no savings anywhere can be possible. Of course the Congressional appropriations committees are scrutinizing each agency's budget for this purpose. Congressmen pay taxes just as all citizens.

Only, let us keep in mind that cutting "the budget" means cutting programs—and attacks on programs can be disguised as meritorious demands for economy. As long as we recognize that it is programs and policies, not only an abstract budget, which are involved, perhaps we can find some which can be reduced or postponed—and perhaps there are others which should be accelerated and increased, in the national interest and in that of the people of Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD a cogent column by Mr. Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post and Times-Herald for May 1, 1957, on the subject of Republican opposition to the budget presented by the Republican President. This also touches on the matters I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORM OVER BUDGET BREWS ON HILL  
(By Marquis Childs)

Democrats returning from the Easter recess are voicing their indignation over what they heard back home from prominent Republicans. This was no less than a demand that they the Democrats, cut President Eisenhower's \$72 billion budget or take the political rap for big spending.

Those Democrats who have felt obligated to support foreign aid, school construction and other measures Mr. Eisenhower has called for are beginning to ask why they should deliberately put themselves in the line of fire from the Republican rightwing. This reaction to the stop-the-spending propaganda being lavishly poured out in many parts of the country is bad news for the President's program.

In Oregon, an advertisement in newspapers denounced the spending spree, demanding that Uncle Sam come to his senses and start living within the income we can afford. The advertisement was sponsored by six corporations, including the Hyster Co. of Portland, of which Ernest Swigert, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, is the head.

The advertisement, which quotes the President as saying he hopes Congress will cut the budget wherever it can, asks voters to write to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Representative EDITH GREEN, all Democrats.

In other words, here were Republicans calling on Democrats to defeat the President on issues he has repeatedly said are vital. If there are to be any large budget cuts, they must come out of foreign aid or defense, and the President has said that cuts in aid will be damaging to American foreign policy.

This is a pattern that is becoming repetitious. Last year, in response to an urgent appeal from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who said he spoke with the authority of the President in behalf of aid for Yugoslavia, NEUBERGER voted with the administration. Yet when he went back to Oregon some Republicans accused him of being "pro-Communist" because of his vote to give economic help to Marshal Tito.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the Republican leader of the Senate, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Republican policy committee, both opposed the President on aid for Yugoslavia.

The pattern, NEUBERGER and other Democrats complain, is one of having your cake and eating it, too. When NEUBERGER ran for the Senate in 1954, Senators GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, and HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho, went into Oregon to campaign against him on a "back Ike" appeal. Yet the Congressional Quarterly record of votes for the 1956 session of Congress shows that NEUBERGER supported the President on foreign policy on 95 percent of all rollcalls, while the record for MALONE was 27 percent and for DWORSHAK 36 percent.

Shortly before Members of Congress went on their Easter holiday the House defeated an amendment which would have cut the appropriation to support international commissions in which the United States has an important role.

Of the 166 House Members who voted for the cut, 99 were Republicans and 67 were Democrats. Of the 205 who voted against the cut, 128 were Democrats and 77 Republicans. Speaker SAM RAYBURN sputtered indignantly that once again the Democrats had to come to the rescue of the Republican President.

Democratic leaders in both the Senate and House complain that there is little or no effort on either side of the Capitol to rally

support for the President among the Members of his own party. More often than not the attitude is one of indifference or private opposition to what the White House wants.

Returning from his golfing vacation at Augusta, Ga., the third play-rest-work interval since the first of the year, the President will have to face up to the revolt over the budget. In the words of one of his Congressional critics, he will have to fish or cut bait. He will, in short, have to show more effort and determination in behalf of the essentials of his program than he has demonstrated during the past 4½ years.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is prepared to deliver a speech. I have talked to the Senator, and I wonder if it is satisfactory to him to relinquish the floor to me for a short time.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my remarks today, which will be brief, follow the same subject which has been discussed today by the distinguished Senator from New York, and only now by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. My remarks will be general, but, as I stated yesterday on the floor, I think the time has come when Members on this side of the aisle should attempt to place in proper perspective the budget request of the President of the United States.

It is unquestioned that the President's proposals for the budget have aroused widespread interest throughout the country, and even sharp debate in the Congress of the United States. As I see it, objections to this budget have taken two principal forms. First, there has been widespread criticism of its fiscal aspects. Second, there have been bitter attacks made against the basic purposes and the specific programs of the Eisenhower administration.

The first aspect of this debate is undoubtedly a valuable one to the country. It is the searching examination and review of the expenditures which are proposed, and the policies upon which they are based. Also, there is substantial agreement in the Congress and in the country upon certain principles regarding the budget.

There is agreement that fiscal solvency and stability is the indispensable base for the growth of the country's economy. It cannot be disputed that the President and the Congress must keep expenditures in control, to hold in check, as the able Senator from Connecticut has just stated, the inflationary pressure which threatens the expansion of our economy, necessary defense measures, and the very living standards of our people. It is our duty to strike from this budget, as any budget, waste, unnecessary expenditures, and even programs which can be postponed. And I point out that this the President has recognized in his recent budget reduction suggestions to the Congress. Certainly on this side of the aisle all of us have agreed that unnecessary expenses should be eliminated. But, in the debate which has ensued since the submission of the budget, charges of fiscal irresponsibility have been made against President Eisenhower and his administration. It is right that the rec-



ord of the administration should be recalled, and that the present budget be put in proper perspective.

From the close of World War II until 1953, when President Eisenhower assumed office, a balanced budget had been achieved in only 3 fiscal years. Two of them were fiscal year 1948 and fiscal year 1949. Undoubtedly the Republican 80th Congress had its influence upon the attainment of balanced budgets in those years. When President Eisenhower took office, he found the 1953 budget unbalanced by \$9.4 billion, and if he had not cut drastically the 1954 budget submitted by President Truman, a deficit of \$10.1 billion would have resulted.

In addition to the national debt, obligations of the Korean war, amounting to \$80 billion, had not been paid and had to be absorbed in the ensuing budgets of the President's administration.

I do not criticize the administration of President Truman for those obligations, because they were obligations of the Korean war, but it is a fact that in part they had to be absorbed in the budgets of President Eisenhower.

Yet, the record establishes the truth that President Eisenhower has attained effective control of the Federal budget. The fiscal 1956 budget was balanced and returned a surplus of \$1.6 billion to the Federal Treasury. The 1957 budget, with 2 months left to run, will also be balanced and will return an estimated surplus of \$1.7 billion. And the budget now under study is balanced and is estimated to produce a surplus of \$1.8 billion.

All of this means that more than \$5 billion will have been used to reduce the national debt under President Eisenhower's leadership.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to inform the Senate—and in case he does not have the information ready at his fingertips, to supply it for the Record—the size of the public debt at the time of President Eisenhower's inauguration and the size of the public debt today.

Mr. COOPER. I do not have the exact figures, but I understand the question which the distinguished Senator is raising. The debt has increased, but the debt has increased, as the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] so well pointed out, because this administration had to pay the deficit obligations of the previous administration.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the first fiscal year, which ended in 1953, before the Eisenhower administration presented a budget, resulted in a deficit of approximately \$9½ billion?

Mr. COOPER. I just called attention to that in my remarks.

Mr. BUSH. Which would partly give the answer to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, for whom I have high regard and warm personal affection, that fancy bookkeeping indeed is required to both reduce and increase the national debt at the same time.

Mr. COOPER. I was speaking of the payments on the national debt, in calling attention to the debt reduction, and I insist it is a debt reduction.

In calling attention to this debt reduction we should also recall that a major tax reduction was voted in 1954. In its first year of operation this tax reduction saved individual and corporate taxpayers a total of \$7,363,000,000. And this reduction, of course, has brought similar savings in subsequent years.

I do not believe it is possible, as some critics of this budget have tried to do, to attain comparison with the budgets of 1939, or 1940, or even 1950. The reasons are obvious. It is possible, however, to obtain a clearer picture of the proposed 1958 budget by contrasting it with the fiscal 1953 budget. In fiscal 1953 the Federal budget represented 21 percent of the gross national product. In fiscal 1958 the President has proposed a Federal budget which represents 16 percent of the gross national product. It is true, of course, that in 1953 we were fighting the Korean war, a terribly expensive proposition. It is also true, however, that in 1957 and assuredly in 1958, the United States is maintaining the most extensive and most effective system of military and economic defense relationships throughout the world, also an expensive proposition.

It can be fairly said that beginning with the sharp reduction made by this administration in the final proposed budget submitted by President Truman, President Eisenhower has succeeded in reducing expenditures and maintaining revenues to the point where the Federal Government is at long last operating in the black.

But I have not risen particularly to speak about specific items in the budget, for they will be considered as appropriation bills come before us. Nor do I join issue with those who want to exercise a searching review of expenditures in the budget, as they have done with past budgets.

There are many in this Congress and throughout the Nation who are concerned with inflation who are approaching the budget from that viewpoint.

I have risen to speak briefly today about the second aspect of the attack upon the budget, which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks. It is the attack against the very goals which President Eisenhower has set for his administration.

President Eisenhower has stated on many occasions clearly and forcefully the overriding purposes of his administration, that is, to secure a lasting peace in the world based on justice and to enlarge the area of freedom and opportunity for all our people at home.

The platform adopted in San Francisco last summer represented a statement of these broad purposes in terms of specific programs and policies. Many here contributed to the writing of the platform, and many pledged specific support to it.

I think it could be said here that many would not be here today but for that platform and for the leader that we followed in 1956.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to state to the Senator that I campaigned the length and breadth of New York in the last election, most intensively. There were some things on which I was opposed to what the President was advocating, but I was able, I felt, to secure the great majority of support in that State because of the composite, which was the whole program, and, more than that, because of the basic philosophy which animated it, which the people felt was enlightened and truly middle of the road.

I congratulate the Senator for pointing out that what those of us who have spoken today, and others who, I hope, will speak after us, are trying to do is to state and maintain our own faith. I congratulate the Senator for making that clear.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. As did the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I wish to mention a few of the commitments of the platform. They include:

Federal aid for public-school construction;

Extension of coverage of the minimum wage;

Expansion of the social-security program;

A Federal health reinsurance program;

An effective civil-rights program; and Economic-aid programs to counter the Soviet economic offensive.

It is possible, of course, that all Members on our side may not agree with every one of these objectives. I myself substantially agree. However, the program represents the considered decision of my party.

While great programs were commenced in the administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman, many voters had come to believe that those programs simply represented change, and change without direction. They turned to President Eisenhower in 1952 and again in 1956 to seek direction. They found that his purpose, as translated into specific programs, was to promote national security and progress within the limits of the Nation's fiscal ability.

The Eisenhower administration's program has been a moderate one. It has avoided extremes, both of the right and of the left. It has retained progressive

programs inherited from previous administrations. Yet it has faced the conditions which confront this country in the mid-20th century, and has focused attention on programs which would advance the cause of freedom abroad and at home.

I do not intend this afternoon to try to speak comprehensively on the aims of the President's program. There will be time for that during the discussion of the appropriation bills which come before us. I should like to point out at least some of those aims with respect to foreign policy, and with respect to our domestic program.

With respect to foreign policy, I believe two main approaches—and, I may add, successful approaches—of President Eisenhower could be placed in jeopardy by the attacks on the budget.

The Eisenhower administration has insisted that defense spending be maintained at a level which will provide security for this country. The achievement of nuclear weapons by Soviet Russia and the relative diminution in strength of our allies have cast up the United States as the only Western country possessing sufficient power to protect its own security and the security of the democratic systems of the free countries of the world. That was dramatically demonstrated a few days ago when the British Government issued its white paper saying that the security of the world today depended upon the nuclear deterrence owned by the United States.

This has required the highest peacetime defense budget in our history, but it has accomplished its purpose. We are at peace, and this program stands in successful contrast to American weakness prior to World War II and the Korean war. I say that this defense must be maintained.

The Eisenhower administration has also had the vision to realize that military measures alone will not attain national security. My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has discussed the objectives of our foreign-aid program. By that program this administration has sought to attain security in cooperation with the other free countries, by adding them to maintain their political and economic independence. In those countries—and perhaps in the uncommitted areas of the world—the future of freedom may well be decided.

I have had some opportunity to observe the importance and influence of those programs. At some later date I expect to address myself more specifically to our foreign-aid programs.

These attacks against the defense and foreign-aid budget reveal a stubborn area of isolationism in both parties. Those who represent it are a small but very vocal and powerful group. They refuse to face the facts of America's position in the world today, and some of them use the budget as a cloak behind which to protect programs and policies which the President, the administration, and the Congress have determined to be essential to achieve our security and to move toward peace. This is true even though only 6 months ago there was grave

danger of our involvement in war in the Middle East, and even though this danger continues.

I shall select only one item on the domestic side of the budget for brief discussion. I wish to discuss the widespread attack on the President's proposal to furnish aid to the States for school construction.

This country is the richest in all the world. It now enjoys its greatest prosperity. Yet it is a country in which there is great disparity of educational opportunity among its various sections. Even worse, there is a deterioration in the quality of education. Surely our Government can afford to make a contribution to provide its children with an equal start in life.

I was reminded yesterday, when the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] submitted his report upon the selection of five great Senators whose portraits are to be hung in the reception room, that one of the five who were named was the great Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio.

Many have chosen him as their standard and paragon of conservatism. Yet that great Senator fought for the principle of opportunity—not security, but the principle of opportunity. He introduced bills in the Congress to that end, and fought for them. At one time he secured passage through the Senate of a bill to provide Federal aid for education, because, as he said so well, it would provide equal opportunity to the young men and young women of this country.

There are groups who attack this budget because of their open hostility to social progress. They represent a small minority, but they are well financed and extremely persistent. After 20 years they refuse to accept the social and economic reforms which have long since become a part of our American system. It is ironic that many of those people have prospered greatly under this administration; yet they would deny opportunities, even on a greatly reduced scale, to others.

It is my hope that in the budget review and budget decisions which we must make during the next few months my party and this Congress will not isolate themselves from the continuing needs of economic justice, greater political freedom and opportunity at home, and the objective of security and peace, together with the advancement of freedom in the world.

Finally, Mr. President, I would suggest that the responsibility for providing the administration with the means and with the leadership for carrying out the aims of the administration of President Eisenhower rests with the members of the Republican Party in Congress.

Like others, I have pledged myself to review carefully all budget requests and to help eliminate any waste and unnecessary programs. However, I have risen also to speak against the effort which is used by some to attack the great aims and objectives of the administration and to attack the President himself. I believe it is the duty of our party to preserve the purposes and aims of the administration.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Kentucky upon his splendid presentation this afternoon and for his forthright contribution to this continuing debate on the budget for the next fiscal year.

The Senator is one who is well qualified to speak on the subject. He has a very thorough grasp on the importance of certain sections of the budget because of his experience. I am thinking particularly of the items in the budget which relate to our foreign policy, our foreign service, our mutual security program, and our technical assistance program. He has seen those programs as they have been applied, and he has seen them at first hand and at close range. Therefore, it is a comfort to me to have his appraisal of these items in the budget.

I congratulate him on the forthright manner in which he has stated his views today.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, would like to join my colleague in congratulating the Senator from Kentucky on his action today. I should like to point out, too, that this argument has been going too far and too much the other way. It is high time that the voices of responsibility of our elective representatives, who have the people to depend upon, be raised in speaking to this subject. I do not believe anyone need fear telling the American people the truth.

I congratulate my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky on the budget. He has made a fair and timely statement, in which he has stated, I believe, the view of all Members of the Senate, that while we must economize and cut the budget wherever we can, we must not forget the basic objectives, not only of the administration, but also of our great Nation, of which all of us are a part, when it comes to living among the nations of the world and living strong domestically from a defense standpoint and an economic standpoint.

I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.



I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk through Monday, May 6, to permit other Senators who may be interested to join as sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 1986) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. COTTON. I wish briefly to acquaint the Senate with the background and the purposes of the bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, which I have just sent to the desk. The Record should show as clearly as possible the reason for and the purposes of the measure, and exactly what it provides.

The Government Corporations Appropriations Act of 1948 contains the following legislative provision:

None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress.

That provision of law has remained in full force since 1948, but its effect has been modified. In an opinion dated September 10, 1955, the general counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Joseph C. Swidler, advised the TVA board:

In thus prohibiting the use of revenues for construction of "new power producing projects" without prior Congressional approval, Congress clearly intended that the prohibition should apply only to new steam plants and single-purpose power dams, and not to generating units in existing plants or to transmission facilities.

The effect of that ruling is twofold. First, it casts doubt on what the law is with regard to the use of TVA's revenues; second, it tends to indicate, if we accept it as it is stated, that so long as its revenue is not used to construct complete new powerplants, as many additional units to present plants may be constructed as the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority in its wisdom deems proper and necessary. In view of the developments in technology, it is perfectly possible in this way to increase the power producing capability of the Tennessee Valley Authority tremendously and to transmit its power over a greatly expanded territory.

The question that has risen because of this ruling came to a head last year, in 1956, in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill. At that time, the administration requested an appropriation of \$3,500,000 in the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956, to finance construction work on additional generating units at the John Sevier steam plant.

The majority of the House Appropriations Committee denied the funds and stated:

The committee finds that the Tennessee Valley Authority power revenues have provided it with sufficient funds for the con-

struction of such additional units as TVA now requires, and believes that the agency should follow normal business procedure, using its revenues to the extent necessary.

A minority of the committee issued a strong statement of minority views. The views of the majority prevailed in the House of Representatives.

I might interpolate that the majority views were almost bound to prevail because, as a result of the committee's action, the supplemental appropriation bill carried no funds for this purpose; and a motion to change the legislative situation would have been ruled out of order.

When that appropriation bill reached the Senate, the Senate Committee on Appropriations took a decidedly opposite viewpoint. No question was raised, or at least very little question was raised, about the desirability or the necessity of the new units requested and required by the TVA, but the Senate committee felt that to pass the bill in the form in which it was sent over by the House would mean that Congress had, tacitly at least, and by implication, surrendered its control of the use of the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is the creation and the child of Congress. So the Senate Committee on Appropriations placed back in the appropriation bill last year the specific appropriation for TVA for the new installations and thus denied TVA use of its power revenues with Congressional approval. The question, I repeat and wish to emphasize, was not as to the necessity or the desirability of the installations; it was whether, by passing the bill without appropriating the money for this purpose, Congress would surrender its control over the revenues and would, to that extent, place its mark of approval on the interpretation made by the general counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Senate followed the recommendations of its own Committee on Appropriations. The matter was then thrashed out in the committee of conference. Finally, the necessity of passing the supplemental appropriation bill caused the Senate conferees to yield. So the bill was passed without the definite appropriation. Two of the conferees, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. BRIDGES), and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. SALTONSTALL), felt so strongly about the principle involved that they refused to sign the conference report.

I call attention to the fact that the Senate went on record backing its own committee. In the course of the debate in the Senate, I recall that it was repeatedly urged that this question should be settled by a regular legislative bill, and should not be settled in a collateral way in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill. That is the reason why at this time I am introducing this measure.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. Yes; I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I recall the debate last year, to which the able Senator from New Hampshire refers. I recall, too, the

joint service which the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire and the junior Senator from Tennessee enjoyed as members of the Committee on Appropriations of the other body. There are few men who have a more detailed and comprehensive understanding of the operations of the independent agencies of the Government than that which is enjoyed by the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

I think the able Senator has approached the pending problem in a correct way. Although I disagree with the advisability of the enactment of the bill which the able Senator is introducing, it is, in my opinion, the proper way to approach the subject rather than to attach a rider to an appropriation bill.

The able Senator from New Hampshire and I enjoy joint service on the Senate Committee on Public Works, to which the bill he is introducing will be referred. I hope the bill will receive consideration, and I shall join him in requesting consideration. It is my hope that after consideration, the committee will deem the recommendation of its enactment unwise.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will not think I am trespassing on his time—

Mr. COTTON. Not at all. I am very happy to have the contribution of the Senator from Tennessee to the matter. It is something on which we have worked together, as the Senator has mentioned, both in our service in the House of Representatives, when we were members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations, and in the Senate on the Committee on Public Works.

While we may not see this proposal from the same point of view, it is a pleasure to discuss it with the Senator. I am glad he is on the floor, and I appreciate his contribution to the discussion. I want him to go ahead and to feel perfectly free to say whatever he desires to say about the matter. I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has again demonstrated the generosity, the graciousness, for which we, his colleagues, love him.

The Senator will recall that although certain citizens from the area which I have the opportunity to represent, in part, opposed such action, I, as a Member of the other body, supported the provision in the 1948 act.

Mr. COTTON. I remember that.

Mr. GORE. Furthermore, I joined with him in supporting the requirement that the TVA projects be amortized over a 40-year period, this likewise being over the opposition of some of my compatriots from the area of the country which I have the opportunity and the honor, in part, to represent.

I do not agree, however, with the interpretation of the 1948 act which the able Senator from New Hampshire now places upon it. The history of the legislation makes it very plain, I think, that the reference is to new plants. An additional generator to be installed in the dam across the Tennessee River at

Muscle Shoals should not, in my opinion, be considered as a new plant. Neither should an additional generating unit at an existing steam plant be regarded as a new plant, but rather as an additional installation in an already established plant.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his statement. He has very clearly stated the points on which we can work together and the points on which we disagree. Incidentally, the Senator's knowledge, not only of the history, but also of the engineering and mechanical operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, most of which is in his State, is exhaustive. I know he will correct me if I am in error. I believe he will agree that, whereas in the early days of the Tennessee Valley Authority and in a measure up to the present time, a steam unit generated approximately 50,000 or 75,000 kilowatts, it is now perfectly possible and feasible to install steam units which will generate 200,000 or even possibly 300,000 kilowatts of power. Thus, when units of modern type are added, it is perfectly possible to increase tremendously the power-producing potentialities of any one plant, whether it be a hydroelectric plant, a steam plant, or a combination of the two.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I agree fully with the Senator from New Hampshire. Indeed, whereas the first steam-plant generating units constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority were—as the able Senator from New Hampshire has said—of the order of 50,000 kilowatts capacity, and I think some in the case of the Norris Dam were of 25,000 kilowatt capacity, the newest steam plant constructed by the TVA, upon authorization by the Congress, has units of 250,000 kilowatts installed capacity, each. So the Senator from New Hampshire is entirely correct. However, that development is the result of improved technology, not the result of modification of the law, brought about by interpretation by the General Counsel of the TVA of the law.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct, and I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement.

At this point I wish to state—because of the point the Senator from Tennessee has raised—that I do not assert that the increased power-producing potentialities have anything to do with a change in the original meaning of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948. I mention it now to show the necessity of a very definite, clear-cut expression of Congressional control, because the increased potentialities of the new, modern units, together with the increased efficiency of transmission, mean that if the TVA is to have complete, carte blanche authority to use its revenues to build new units, it can extend its activities to a very large degree without Congressional approval. If that is what the Congress wants, the Senator from New Hampshire will, of course, yield to the will of the majority. However, I think that of itself

requires an expression of Congressional intent.

At this point I wish to refer briefly to the report, last year—1956—of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Senate committee voted to restore the requested appropriation; and in its report the committee said:

The committee believes it is unwise for the TVA to continue a policy whereby units can be added at existing plants without coming to the Congress for authorization and funds. The committee urges the appropriate legislative committee to act on this matter in order to clarify this situation before the next appropriation request is submitted to the Congress.

That is a formal request by the Senate Appropriations Committee that the appropriate legislative committee take such action. The reason why I have presumed to take the initiative in introducing such a bill is that the appropriate legislative committee, I assume, is the Committee on Public Works; and I expect that the Chair in his wisdom will refer the bill to that committee.

At this time I wish to quote briefly from a letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States, dated March 26, 1956, at a time when this controversy was in progress. The letter was addressed to the Honorable JOHN TABER, of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. The letter covers various subjects, but it includes the following:

This letter is not addressed to the question of TVA's statutory authority, which has been the subject of considerable discussion and disagreement, except to recommend that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities. We believe such legislation is necessary at this time because, in our opinion, (1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities. It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities.

Mr. President, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, from the Comptroller General of the United States, and from many others, comes the call for clarification of this matter. Whatever may have been the original intent—and I shall not take time to argue that point at the present time with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, and whatever may be the justice and accuracy of the interpretation by the General Counsel of the TVA, at least there is so much doubt upon this matter that Congress should have an opportunity to pass upon the question of whether it is going to surrender to the board of the TVA the discretion to use the revenues of the TVA to expand its operations, when in the course of technological development that expan-

sion could be very considerable and, in fact, could extend for great areas and could include large cities outside the present service perimeter of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In just a moment I shall be glad to yield further to the Senator from Tennessee; but, first, I wish to call attention briefly to some of the provisions of the bill I have introduced, in order that the Senate may understand exactly what the bill seeks to do.

In the first place, the bill, which I have just introduced, would amend the last paragraph under the subtitle "Independent Agencies and Corporations," in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, now reading as follows:

None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress (16 U. S. C. 831h-2).

Section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C. 831y), contains a broad grant of power to the TVA Board over the use of power revenues or any other revenues accruing to the Corporation. The section provides that proceeds from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation shall be paid as miscellaneous receipts of the United States Treasury at the end of each calendar year, but then contains the following:

Save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy.

Mr. President, I consider it necessary, therefore, to include in the bill the phrase "notwithstanding section 26" so that the limitations contained therein will also be a limitation on the authority to expend power revenues contained in section 26.

In other words, the bill does not affect this broad power, except it states that, notwithstanding this provision, Congress shall continue to control the use of revenues insofar as they are used for new power generating facilities.

The bill next provides that power revenues can only be expended for the "construction, or acquisition of any power producing units, installations, facilities or projects" as Congress may approve in its consideration of TVA's annual budget. This means that if TVA were to seek authority to expend power revenues for the stated purposes, the request for such authority would have to be contained in the President's budget.

The first proviso sets forth in exact detail just how Congress shall express its approval for the use of power revenues by TVA. This is important. This must be done by specific language in an appropriation bill, and would preclude the use of committee reports as a vehicle of approval. It should be made perfectly plain that the bill provides that.

I want to emphasize, and particularly to call to the attention of my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the last



proviso in the bill, which contains the phrase "except for replacement purposes." It defines the phrase to mean:

The repair or replacement of an existent unit, installation or facility, which replacement would not result in increasing the number of units, installations or facilities at existent plants.

That, of course, means—and I want to emphasize this—that in presenting this measure to the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire is not seeking to stifle or hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority. Rather, he is seeking to have Congress clearly define its continual control over its expansion. This particular provision, the last provision in the bill, makes it clear that if this bill became the law, the Tennessee Valley Authority, or its Board, could use its revenue to replace a steam unit that, at present, produces only 50,000 kilowatts with one that produces 250,000 kilowatts. It simply prohibits new, additional units without the authority of the Congress.

I wish to mention one other matter, and then I shall yield to my friend and be through. As my friend from Tennessee knows, for he has been acting as chairman of the subcommittee considering the bills, there are at present two bills being considered by the Committee on Public Works. One of them is S. 1869, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself and Senators HILL, GORE, KEFAUVER, STENNIS, EASTLAND, and SPARKMAN. The other one is S. 1855, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Both bills are designed to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds, borrow money, conduct its business, build its facilities, and repair and extend its operations as any other business does, without coming back every year for appropriations from the Congress.

The bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma provides, in its present form, that if the Tennessee Valley Authority, exercising the power proposed to be conferred on it, is to extend its operations beyond the perimeter of its present service, it shall notify the Congress and wait 60 days for action that the Congress might take in connection thereto.

S. 1855, introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], provides that the Tennessee Valley Authority cannot use its revenues to extend its operations beyond its present service area without coming back to the Congress for specific authorization.

If the provision concerning expansion in S. 1855 should receive the approval of the Public Works Committee and should be approved by the Congress, that would settle this question, so that the bill I am presenting today would be unnecessary. However, there are many other factors in the proposed bills of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that are controversial.

They include factors such as a limit on bonding authority, how bonds shall be floated, whether they shall be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury

as to the time and form, and provisions for repayment to the Treasury of the taxpayers' investment in the Tennessee Valley Authority. So that I think it is reasonable to say that the outcome of the bills is extremely doubtful.

Therefore, the Senator from New Hampshire has at this time presented this bill, hoping it will be referred to the Committee on Public Works and hoping there will be prompt consideration of it by the Senate, because it excludes all the other questions and simply goes to the heart of this matter, which was the subject of such sharp controversy last year. That was that in constructing new power facilities, whether they be in a plant by themselves or whether they be additional units to present plants, specific approval of the Congress should be obtained. In other words, if TVA is to extend its operations into a wider territory, and run longer distances and take in new cities and new territories, it should have the specific approval of the Congress, which it had to have until 1955, when the TVA ruling was made.

That is the purpose of my bill. I am sorry to have taken so much time of the Senate, but I wanted the RECORD to show that clearly.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the able Senator and I find ourselves in disagreement as to the legislative intent and the proper interpretation of the 1948 provision. I join him, however, in the view that it is entirely proper for the Congress to review the 1948 provision, and review it in the light of the improved technology to which the able Senator has made reference. In determining whether or not it is necessary for the Congress to enact law which would be further restrictive of the management of the TVA by its Board of Directors in a business-like way, the Senator points to bills pending now before the Senate Public Works Committee, and to the possibility that, by use of revenue, an expansion of the TVA might be possible.

The possible expansion to which the able Senator refers might be either geographic expansion or a vertical expansion, that is, an increase in the generating capacity of the TVA to serve the area presently served by the TVA.

I think the Senator will agree that the service area which the TVA now supplies, and which it has been supplying, is one where production of electricity has been rather static for 12 years now. Were the revenues of TVA not required for amortization of the projects already in being, the apprehension of the able Senator might, in the view of the junior Senator from Tennessee, have more point. But when the amortization requirement is coupled with the requirement for payments in lieu of taxes, considering the enormous demand for increased electricity in the TVA area, I just doubt that there is any ground for real apprehension of a geographic expansion of the TVA.

I agree, however, that it is a matter to which Congress can and properly should give attention.

Mr. COTTON. May I say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Senator from New Hampshire does not necessarily indicate he is apprehensive or that he necessarily objects to certain expansion of the TVA. The point that he does emphasize, and the reason for this proposed legislation, is that if there is to be such expansion it should have the full consideration of the Congress of the United States, where every State and every section, whether far away from or contiguous to the Tennessee Valley, will have an opportunity to consider the wisdom and fairness and advisability of such expansion.

Also, while I agree that the Senator from Tennessee is correct in stating that during the past few years there has not been substantial expansion or growth of TVA, there has been some. I have in mind at this moment that the city of Memphis was insistent that the Tennessee Valley Authority produce electric energy for that city some time ago.

I think the question of expansion is a very real one. I am not stating that necessarily we should say there shall be none, but it is important, I think, that we should have complete control. That is the purpose of the legislation.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his contribution.

I wish to apologize to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is about to take the floor, for the time we have consumed.

#### PROGRESS IN MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to have this week go by without discussing briefly some of the progress we have been making in mental health treatment.

President Eisenhower has set aside this week, beginning April 28, as National Mental Health Week, and as I regard mental health one of our most serious problems, I wish to take this opportunity to discuss some of the problems in connection with it and also report progress that is being made in the cure and control of this disease.

It is only in recent years that we have actually come to grips with this problem and are now treating patients for mental illness instead of incarcerating them in hospitals, which, in reality, became prisons for the rest of their lives.

We in Kansas have been most fortunate, in that the Menninger Foundation—which is internationally known—is located at Topeka, Kans., and has for many years conducted a program of research and carried on clinical demonstrations which prove that mental illness responds to treatment just like physical ailments.

As we observed the effectiveness of the work of the Menninger Foundation, we in Kansas became convinced that their program was good not only for Kansas, but for the Nation.

It was in 1947 that Kansas decided to do something about its mental health problem, and while I shall discuss the mental health program from a national standpoint, I also wish to discuss some

of the changes that have taken place in Kansas since 1947.

It was my privilege to serve as Governor of the State of Kansas. I not only took a personal part in the campaign which our citizens and the Kansas Legislature approved, but took steps necessary to get the program underway.

One of my first official acts was to appoint a commission composed of outstanding doctors and private citizens and charge them with the responsibility of making recommendations to the Governor and the legislature for changes in our mental health program.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator for the success of the program which he had the honor and foresight to inaugurate in the great State of Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the kind remarks of the very able Senator from Tennessee. It is not only true that we have made great progress in Kansas, but great progress has been made in many States of the Nation—most States at the present time. However, 10 or 15 years ago there was not sufficient attention paid to the mentally ill of this Nation. I am happy we are now making this progress. I know Tennessee has made progress, as well as many other great States.

Mr. GORE. May I say that under the administration of Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, very great progress has been made in this field. In this activity, as in other fields in the area of human welfare, Governor Clement has taken a very keen personal interest.

Mr. CARLSON. That is very commendable.

In 1948 we were spending \$1.06 per patient-day, while in 1953 we spent \$3.87 and \$4.73 in 1955.

I have before me a report from Dr. George W. Jackson, Director of Institutions in Kansas, for the year 1956, which states that the daily cost per patient has increased 41.2 percent, but operating expenses per patient released alive has decreased 42.2 percent.

According to Dr. Jackson, of the 1,040 first admissions—that is, people admitted to our mental hospitals—during fiscal year 1955, the following dispositions had been made within 1 year: still in hospital, 25.77 percent; discharged, 37.02 percent; on trial visit, 23.56 percent; in family care, 5 percent; deaths and otherwise absent, 8.65 percent.

That, to me, tells the story of the great progress that has been made within our State, when you realize that only one-fourth of those who were admitted during the year 1955 were in the State hospitals at the end of the year.

The fact that 37 percent were discharged as cured, about 25 percent were out on trial visit, and 5 percent in family care demonstrates that Kansas' program is paying dividends.

In Kansas during the year 1949, with more people in our mental hospitals, only 455 were released, while the number released in 1955 was 1,356.

About 80 percent of those admitted to our hospitals are released in 1 year. This 80 percent includes about 8 or 9 percent who died during their stay in the hospital.

Things have been happening in a good many States, but my responsibility, I think, is to try to tell what has happened in the State of Kansas that has materially changed our whole mental hospital situation.

I am proud of the fact that Kansas is probably the only State in the Union in which the mental hospital population has gone down in the past 5 years. It is down now more than 7 percent, in contrast to the national average, which shows roughly an increase of 15 percent. Even with our Kansas State hospitals still quite inadequately staffed, 74 percent of the folks who entered those hospitals in 1954 went home, most of them within a period of from 3 to not to exceed 6 months.

I believe that Kansas has the only system of State hospitals in the country where there is not a long waiting list and where people do not have to sit in jail for a week or a month before they can even enter a hospital where a doctor might see them a month later.

It is possible and probable, I think, that in Kansas we shall never have to build additional hospital beds if we can keep our present program going. To be sure, we shall have to build some replacements, but when we started this program, the Public Health Service told us that we needed 3,800 more beds; in very rough figures, they would have cost \$38 million. That sum was not spent—and I do not believe it will need to be spent.

Thus, our experience to date suggests strongly that increased expenditures for the care and treatment of the mentally ill are good investments not only in human values, but also in terms of dollars and cents.

Under a program of custodial care only, relatively few patients are released, hospital populations build up and up, more beds must constantly be provided, at an average cost of approximately \$10,000 per bed; and no solution to the problem of mental illness is ever in sight.

On the other hand, a dynamic program of psychiatric care and treatment makes possible the improvement and cure of a great many patients who can then be released as useful citizens of the community again. Turnover is much greater, more patients can be treated and discharged, and mental hospital populations may actually decline, as they have in Kansas. Thus, it may never be necessary to build the additional buildings and beds, which would otherwise be needed to provide for a constantly increasing hospital population.

Mr. President, I requested the National Committee Against Mental Illness, Inc., to furnish me some recent statistics in regard to the progress made in the treatment of mental illness during the past few years.

It is interesting to note that at the close of 1956, for the first time in history, there was a reduction under that of the previous year in the number of resident patients in State mental hospi-

tals. This reduction amounted to approximately 7,000 under the resident patient figure at the close of 1955.

The decrease is particularly remarkable when one notes that 1956 was a record year for admissions—approximately 186,000 mental patients were admitted to hospitals in 1956, as against 178,000 in 1955, and only 115,000 in 1945.

It is also significant, when one considers that since 1945, when figures on mental hospital population were first collected on a national scale, that there had been an average increase of 9,400 patients each year in the total mental hospital load.

This progress is most encouraging to me, and furnishes proof that every State in the Union can do what the State of Kansas has done during the past decade.

Mental illness is a real and continuing national problem, when we realize that 1 out of every 10 persons will spend some part of his life in a mental hospital.

This means about 16 million people now living in the United States will be hospitalized for mental illness at one time or another unless new treatment and cures are found.

I believe it can be definitely proved that mental illness or other personality disturbances are usually significant factors in criminal behavior, delinquency, suicide, alcoholism, narcotics addiction, and very often in cases of divorce.

The statistics on the number of cases of the above-mentioned problems are appalling; and it is only in recent years that we have begun fully to understand that they are most often the result of mental disturbances.

One of the most interesting studies I have read in recent years on mental illness was a survey by the Menninger Foundation, completed in 1954, which indicates that emotional ills in industry cost this Nation billions of dollars in productivity each year.

Figures from this report reveal that as a result of mental disturbances, industry suffered a \$9 billion loss because of absenteeism from work; that 80 to 90 percent of the accidents were due to psychological causes, which cost an untold sum of money.

It was interesting to note further from this report that alcoholism represents a loss to industry in excess of \$1 billion. One out of every 50 workers is a problem drinker and 89 percent of these are in the 35 to 55 year range.

Financial losses may easily be determined on the basis of statistics, but no one can place an estimate on the agonies, heartaches, and the suffering of those who are close to patients suffering from mental illness. Many of the heartrending problems of the patient and those closely associated with him could be cited, however, I wish to relate a few of the experiences that came to light in our study of the hospital situation in Kansas.

Here are some of the human interest stories:

One woman who had been there for 20 years had not spoken a word over the last 8 years. Her doctor was not discouraged, however—he was a young fellow. If I had been that man, perhaps I would not have had the courage he had to try to help her.



He began spending time with her, and in the course of 2 weeks she began to talk. No one had ever tried to talk to her before that, I guess. Now she is a practical nurse in the community, after spending 22 years in the State hospital because no one ever took any interest in her.

Among the patients where cases were reviewed when the new staff took over was a hot-tempered Dane who somehow had gotten shuffled into the Topeka State Hospital 19 years previously. There was no evidence that the man was ever sick enough to have been hospitalized. He had gotten into a little difficulty with the law and was put in the State hospital. He spoke little English, and the harder he tried to prove he was not sick, the more the authorities believed he was very ill. He is back in Denmark now.

Perhaps the most tragic of these human-interest stories was that of a young woman of about 23. She was a rather pretty, sweet girl, but her hair was bedraggled and neglected. She was standing by the door one day when the doctor went up to speak to her. The doctor asked, "What are you doing here?" and her answer was, "I guess I am just waiting to get like the rest of them." She had never had a doctor talk to her at all.

We were indeed gratified to see that these good things could happen—that people in mental hospitals can be helped to get well.

These and thousands of similar cases have been treated and cured. The question now is, Where do we go from here?

First, I strongly urge that the Congress, the States, and private organizations and institutions engaged in this work vote increased funds for the type of programs that are paying dividends. We must not be niggardly with funds for the treatment of the mentally ill. We should not hesitate to vote more funds for research in this field, both from the Federal and State governments.

We need to discover cures and better methods of care and treatment. It is true, we are spending substantial sums of money in this field, but here is one place where we can be of real help.

Quite generally you hear that we should spend large sums of money for new construction and new buildings for our mental patients. With this I am in accord, but I can never forget the statement of Dr. Will Menninger when we were talking about building new mental hospital buildings in Kansas. Dr. Menninger stated at that time that new buildings were fine, but what we needed was more doctors and more trained people to care for our mentally ill. We proceeded on this basis in Kansas, and I think the results speak for themselves.

Since 1947 the people in Kansas have voted on a constitutional amendment providing funds for construction of buildings at our State institutions and this program is now well underway.

We need more funds for the training of additional psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers and nurses to take more efficient care of the increasing number of the mentally ill. Here again we can be of real assistance.

One of the new programs that needs to be encouraged and pays big dividends is

the development of out-patient service. It is probably safe to say that as many as one-third of the patients who are now treated successfully in the clinics would several years ago have been regarded as suitable only for hospital treatment. Treatment in an outpatient clinic is obviously less costly than hospitalization and provides the great therapeutic advantage of allowing the healing process to take place in the same environment in which the illness originated, avoiding the violent transition from community to hospital to community again.

During the next few years, there will probably have to be an appreciable increase in State mental health budgets. While the new drugs and other therapies have led to a remarkable increase in discharge rates, they have also created the demand for thousands of additional psychiatric personnel to treat and return to the community untold numbers of mental patients, which up to now are considered hopeless.

In the long run, however, there is no doubt that increased expenditures for research and training will pay off in the reduction of the number of patients in our State mental hospitals. We have only to look at the research successes against tuberculosis, which have closed TB hospitals all over the country in the past 4 years, to realize that the same thing can be done for mental illness if we spend enough money to use present treatments, to find new ones, and to train the people to apply them.

What if we choose not to spend additional moneys for treatment, research, and training during the coming biennium? The alternative is stark and clear. The States will continue to spend approximately \$350 million a year to construct additional buildings to house the ever-increasing flow of mental patients. The research which developed the new drugs has begun to cut down the resident population, but it will have to be greatly accelerated if we are to win the war against mental illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 6, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2, 1957:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Wilson C. Flake, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ghana.

##### PATENT OFFICE

Maurice Augustus Crews, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Arthur W. Crocker, elevated.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lloyd H. Burke, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Frederick W. Kaess, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

John O. Henderson, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William B. Somers, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Albert W. Saeger, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

George W. Beach, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Noah W. Riley, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

William E. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

William Budd Parsons, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Saul Hale Clark, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Joseph Liberles, rabbi of Temple Ezra, Chicago, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at this time of the year when nature revives and Thy creation is most emphatically expressed, every living thing sings praises to Thee, O Most High. In Thy bounteous grace Thou didst crown all the work of Thy glory with the creation of man. Thou didst bestow upon him the innate love for liberty, the aspiration to be free.

From the day when Moses cried out: "Let my people go," to the moment when God commanded Israel to "proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof," from the hour when Patrick Henry exclaimed, "Give me liberty or give me death," to the resounding of the four freedoms, men have never ceased to be free. May our passion for freedom never abate.

Bestow Thy blessings, O Lord, upon this House and upon the men who are striving to govern with justice, truth, and love. Give them insight and understanding so that their decisions for millions of people will be wise, just, and righteous.

Cast Thy spirit upon them and strengthen them in their endeavors. Gird them with steadfastness and fortitude to achieve progress and growth not only technical and physical but also and more so emotional and spiritual growth.